

## Foreword

Biodiversity underpins all life and provides vital benefits to our societies and economies. Yet despite this, pressures from land-use change, over-exploitation of natural resources, pollution and climate change are contributing to an alarming loss of living diversity. Since 1970 one tenth of the world's terrestrial biodiversity and one third of freshwater biodiversity have been wiped out. We are on course to lose another 10% of terrestrial species by 2050.

We have to reverse these trends. Biodiversity and ecosystem services provide invaluable – but often invisible – benefits at global, regional and local scales. These include services such as nutrient cycling, habitat provisioning, pollination, erosion control and climate regulation. The need to mainstream biodiversity and ecosystem services more effectively into national and sectoral policies has recently gained renewed impetus on the global policy agenda. In line with the Convention on Biological Diversity and the 2011-2020 Aichi Biodiversity Targets, the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development places strong emphasis on biodiversity for achieving these objectives.

The purpose of *Mainstreaming Biodiversity for Sustainable Development* is to highlight examples of good practice and remaining challenges in four key areas. These areas are: mainstreaming biodiversity at the national level; mainstreaming biodiversity in the agriculture, forestry and fisheries sectors; biodiversity mainstreaming in development co-operation; and monitoring and evaluating biodiversity mainstreaming.

Insights are drawn from 16 predominantly megadiverse countries (or those with biodiversity hotspots) as these countries host some of the richest and often most threatened biodiversity in the world. The countries examined also span the full range of income groups, from high-income economies such as Australia and France to lower-income economies such as Ethiopia and Madagascar.

Effectively mainstreaming biodiversity into all levels of government and society can lead to long-term and sustainable development outcomes and enhance the resilience of the ecosystems upon which we depend. The sharing of good practice insights and the identification of remaining challenges can help catalyse learning and foster change.

The report is intended for biodiversity policymakers and practitioners in developed and developing countries, as well as for development co-operation agencies and other national ministries. We hope this study will be of use as together we strive to develop better, more mainstreamed, biodiversity policies for better lives.



Angel Gurría  
Secretary-General, OECD



## *Acknowledgements*

This report has been prepared by the Environment Directorate and the Development Co-operation Directorate of the OECD. Feedback and comments received from delegates of the Working Party on Biodiversity, Water and Ecosystems (WPBWE) of the Environmental Policy Committee and the Network on Environment and Development Co-operation (ENVIRONET) of the Development Assistance Committee are gratefully acknowledged, as are comments from the Joint Working Party on Agriculture and Environment, and the Committee on Fisheries.

This work has also benefited from the presentations and discussions at the OECD workshop “Biodiversity and Development: Mainstreaming and Managing for Results”, which took place on 18 February 2015 in Paris, and other OECD events organised in the margins of various meetings of the Convention on Biological Diversity in 2016 and 2017. For more information, see: [www.oecd.org/environment/resources/mainstream-biodiversity/events/](http://www.oecd.org/environment/resources/mainstream-biodiversity/events/). It also draws on case study research presented in forthcoming OECD working papers “Mainstreaming biodiversity and development: Insights and lessons from Peru” and “Mainstreaming biodiversity and development: Insights and lessons from Ethiopia”, as well as research missions conducted in Madagascar and Viet Nam.

The publication has been written by Katia Karousakis and Megha Sud (OECD Environment Directorate), and Galina Alova and Naeeda Crishna Morgado (OECD Development Co-operation Directorate). Bérénice Lasfargues (OECD) prepared an early draft of Chapter 5. The authors would also like to gratefully acknowledge comments received from the OECD Secretariat, namely Simon Buckle (ENV/CBW); Jan Corfee-Morlot (formerly DCD/GPP); Dimitris Diakosavvas, Julien Hardelin, Roger Martini, Claire Delpuech, James Innes, Barbara Hutniczak (TAD/NRP); Myriam Linster, Ivan Hascic (ENV/EPI); Ziga Zarnic (ENV/GGGR); and Ronnie Downes (GOV/BUD); as well as comments received from Tim Scott (UNDP BIOFIN), and Juha Siikamäki and Tom Brooks (IUCN). Anna Rourke and Jane Kynaston (ENV/CBW) provided administrative support.

The OECD gratefully acknowledges the financial support from the European Commission in undertaking this project, as well as the Federal Ministry for Economic Co-operation and Development, Germany (BMZ), through the German Gesellschaft für Internationale Zusammenarbeit (GIZ). The views expressed herein can in no way be taken to reflect the official opinion of the European Union, BMZ or GIZ.



## *Table of contents*

<b>Acronyms and abbreviations</b> .....	11
<b>Executive summary</b> .....	17
<b>Chapter 1. Good practice insights for mainstreaming biodiversity and development</b> .....	21
1.1. Mainstreaming biodiversity to achieve sustainable development .....	22
1.2. What do mainstreaming biodiversity and development involve? .....	23
1.3. Good practice insights on biodiversity mainstreaming .....	27
1.4. Mainstreaming biodiversity for sustainable development – a blueprint for action .....	33
Notes .....	35
References .....	36
<b>Chapter 2. Mainstreaming biodiversity at the national level</b> .....	39
2.1. Introduction .....	40
2.2. Mainstreaming development and poverty objectives in national biodiversity strategies .....	41
2.3. Mainstreaming biodiversity into national development plans and other strategies .....	44
2.4. Institutional issues .....	49
2.5. Role of data and information in mainstreaming .....	55
2.6. Biodiversity in national budgets .....	59
<i>Annex 2.A1. Mainstreaming development and poverty alleviation in NBSAPs</i> .....	65
<i>Annex 2.A2. Biodiversity mainstreaming in NDPs</i> .....	70
Notes .....	72
References .....	74
<b>Chapter 3. Mainstreaming biodiversity in agriculture, forestry and fisheries</b> .....	79
3.1. Mainstreaming biodiversity in agriculture .....	81
3.2. Mainstreaming biodiversity in forestry .....	94
3.3. Mainstreaming biodiversity in fisheries .....	108
<i>Annex 3.A1. Share of agriculture as % of GDP and in employment in the 16 countries, 2016</i> .....	116
<i>Annex 3.A2. Contribution of the forest sector to employment and GDP in focus countries, 2011</i> .....	117
Notes .....	118
References .....	122
<b>Chapter 4. Mainstreaming biodiversity in development co-operation</b> .....	137
4.1. The role of development finance in funding for biodiversity in developing countries .....	138
4.2. Development co-operation support for mainstreaming in developing countries .....	139
4.3. Mainstreaming biodiversity within development co-operation .....	143
Notes .....	153
References .....	154

<b>Chapter 5. Monitoring and evaluating biodiversity mainstreaming</b> .....	161
5.1. Objectives of monitoring and evaluation of biodiversity mainstreaming .....	162
5.2. Conceptual measurement framework .....	163
5.3. Possible indicators for monitoring and evaluating biodiversity mainstreaming .....	169
<i>Annex 5.A1. UNPEI steps in integration of mainstreaming into national monitoring processes</i> .....	172
Notes .....	174
References .....	174

## Figures

Figure 1.1	Entry points for mainstreaming biodiversity and development .....	25
Figure 2.1	Assessment framework for biodiversity management and mainstreaming .....	40
Figure 2.2	Existing strategies of relevance to NBSAPs .....	45
Figure 2.3	Proportion of union budget allocated to MOECAAF, FD, NWCD and PAs, 2010-15 .....	61
Figure 3.1	Visible and invisible flows from agriculture .....	82
Figure 3.2	OECD agricultural support to farmers by potential environmental impact .....	90
Figure 3.3	Forest area under forest management plans in selected countries .....	98
Figure 3.4	Forest area under certification schemes in selected countries .....	108
Figure 4.1	Bilateral biodiversity-related ODA, 2007-16 .....	139
Figure 4.2	Providers of bilateral biodiversity-related ODA .....	139
Figure 4.3	Bilateral official development assistance activities with biodiversity as a secondary objective 2006-15, two-year averages .....	150
Figure 4.4	Top five sectors receiving bilateral biodiversity-related ODA: Total commitments and biodiversity as share of overall ODA to sector .....	150

## Tables

Table 1.1	Focus countries examined and their characteristics .....	26
Table 2.1	Biodiversity-relevant policy areas covered by various ministries .....	50
Table 2.2	Indicative list of ministries/departments and NBTs of the NBAP in India .....	51
Table 2.3	Lead institutions in charge of the NBSAP implementation in Ethiopia .....	52
Table 2.4	Examples of biodiversity-relevant inter-ministerial committees .....	53
Table 3.1	Examples of policy instruments to mainstream biodiversity in agriculture .....	86
Table 3.2	Examples of policy instruments to mainstream biodiversity in forestry .....	97
Table 3.3	Examples of policy instruments to mainstream biodiversity in fisheries .....	111
Table 4.1	Examples of biodiversity-specific policies and strategies by DAC members .....	144
Table 4.2	Biodiversity and environmental safeguards in multilateral development banks .....	146
Table 5.1	Indicator classification relating to biodiversity mainstreaming .....	164
Table 5.2	Indicators for Aichi Biodiversity Target 2 under Strategic Goal A .....	166
Table 5.3	Examples of possible indicators to monitor progress towards biodiversity mainstreaming ..	169

## Boxes

Box 1.1	SDGs in support of biodiversity conservation and sustainable use .....	22
Box 1.2	What is biodiversity mainstreaming? .....	24
Box 2.1	Examples of stakeholder participation in NBSAP development .....	43
Box 2.2	Bolsa Verde programme in Brazil .....	47
Box 2.3	Examples of data challenges highlighted in NBSAPs and Fifth National Reports .....	56
Box 2.4	A review of biodiversity expenditure data across four countries .....	59
Box 2.5	The BIOFIN Initiative .....	61
Box 2.6	Objectives and insights from BIOFIN in the Philippines .....	62
Box 3.1	Integrating biodiversity into land-use planning in South Africa .....	81
Box 3.2	Agroecology in France .....	84
Box 3.3	Policy instruments to promote sustainable agriculture .....	87
Box 3.4	Ban on diclofenac to prevent vulture extinction in South Asia .....	88
Box 3.5	Environmentally harmful farm input support in Brazil .....	89

Box 3.6	Landcare: A community approach to sustainable land management . . . . .	93
Box 3.7	Viet Nam’s efforts to reverse deforestation: Five Million Hectare Reforestation Programme . . . . .	96
Box 3.8	Long history of forest management in France . . . . .	97
Box 3.9	Community forestry reform in Nepal . . . . .	99
Box 3.10	Indigenous peoples in the management of the Peruvian Amazon . . . . .	100
Box 3.11	Viet Nam’s Payment for Forest Environmental Services . . . . .	102
Box 3.12	Biodiversity offset schemes in Mexico and Brazil . . . . .	104
Box 3.13	Direct and indirect subsidies for monoculture plantations in Indonesia . . . . .	106
Box 3.14	Forest Stewardship Council certification for sustainable use of forest resources . . . . .	107
Box 3.15	Examples of international goals, targets and initiatives relevant to sustainable oceans and fisheries . . . . .	110
Box 3.16	Progress in the implementation of the Code of Conduct for Fisheries . . . . .	112
Box 3.17	Fisheries management in Peru . . . . .	112
Box 3.18	Opportunities for further reform in France . . . . .	115
Box 4.1	Total official support for sustainable development: An emerging measure to track broader financial resources for sustainable development . . . . .	142
Box 4.2	Risk assessment approaches to support biodiversity mainstreaming . . . . .	147
Box 4.3	Capturing the mainstreaming component in ODA through the OECD DAC Rio marker methodology . . . . .	149
Box 4.4	Harnessing synergies between biodiversity and climate change mitigation in REDD+ projects . . . . .	151
Box 5.1	Barriers to learning from M&E . . . . .	163
Box 5.2	UN Poverty-Environment Initiative indicators for successful environmental mainstreaming . . . . .	165
Box 5.3	Examples of indicators proposed in NBSAPs to monitor biodiversity mainstreaming . . . . .	166
Box 5.4	Indicators for the mainstreaming of biodiversity in production landscapes/seascapes and sectors in the GEF biodiversity strategy . . . . .	167





on sector experts and statisticians from the national statistics office. The process should be embedded in the elaboration and monitoring of national/subnational development policy and planning and/or sectoral strategy processes. It should be informed by quality criteria and respond to the need to capture progress and change resulting from the implementation of priority initiatives contained in national plans and sector strategies, as funded by public- and private-sector funds. Indicator formulation could be preceded and informed by a commissioned study that offers a range of poverty-environment indicators, complete with definitions, purpose, institutional roles and responsibilities, and data collection protocols. Another useful input is sector or thematic indicators proposed under other national and/or global initiatives. For instance, national climate change adaptation and mitigation strategies, NBSAPs and green economy strategies have formulated specific indicators that could be considered.

6. **Select a core set of indicators.** Through a consultative process with policy makers from the ministries of planning and key sectors and the national statistics office, practitioners should facilitate a process in which a core set of indicators is selected from among the possible poverty-environment indicators identified in the preceding step. Keep the number of proposed new indicators realistic, as the national statistics office will raise justified concerns related to the costs of data collection, the feasibility of regular data collection and how the data will be used for reporting.
7. **Continuous review and refinement.** The adoption and application of poverty-environment indicators can take five to ten years, owing to the cyclic planning and monitoring process. National development policies and plans and sector strategies are normally subject to five-year review and formulation cycles, and national monitoring systems are linked to these. Experience shows that an indicator can be adopted in the national monitoring system but no data be collected on it over time, either because of a lack of institutional ownership to put data collection systems in place or because it has been determined that data collection is not technically or economically feasible. Consequently, the effectiveness of proposed indicators should be reviewed periodically and indicators dropped or refined accordingly.

## Notes

1. M&E can also address the development and validation of the theory of change underpinning mainstreaming interventions. Theory of change is a specific type of methodology for planning, participation and evaluation that is used in the philanthropy, not-for-profit and government sectors to promote social change.
2. The terms “biodiversity” and “development” are not always clearly defined, or defined differently for different programmes, making it difficult to compare and assess performance (Davies et al., 2013).
3. Contextual factors are a source of inputs and constraints to inputs, processes, outputs, outcomes and impacts; conversely, inputs, processes, outputs, outcomes and impacts feed into the context. Examples of contextual factors include political leadership and stability, and macroeconomic and fiscal policies (Thomas, 2014).
4. Huntley and Redford (2014) classify mainstreaming indicators in seven categories: spatial, government, private sector, individual-based, multilateral donor, poverty alleviation and markets for ecosystem services.
5. According to Scheerens et al. (2011), indicator data should also be sufficiently granular or disaggregated so as to allow for better adjustments and valid causal inferences.
6. Aichi Target 2 states: “By 2020, at the latest, biodiversity values have been integrated into national and local development and poverty reduction strategies and planning processes and are being incorporated into national accounting, as appropriate, and reporting systems”.
7. Aichi Target 3 is to encourage positive incentives and to reform incentives, including subsidies, that are harmful to biodiversity.
8. These are: Target 1: Biodiversity barometer; Target 3: Trends in potentially harmful elements of government support to agriculture; number of countries with biodiversity-relevant taxes; number of countries with biodiversity-relevant fees and charges; number of countries with biodiversity-relevant tradable permit schemes; Target 4: ecological footprint and Red List Index.
9. Ireland has also defined indicators for measures that mainstream biodiversity and use the green, yellow, red traffic light signal to indicate the level of progress. For more information see: <http://indicators.biodiversityireland.ie/index.php?qt=fa&id=5>.

## References

- CBD (2016a), “Indicators for the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020 and the Aichi Biodiversity Targets”, Convention on Biological Diversity, Cancun, <https://www.cbd.int/doc/decisions/cop-13/cop-13-dec-28-en.pdf>.
- CBD (2016b), “Strategic actions to enhance the implementation of the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020 and the achievement of the Aichi Biodiversity Targets,” CBD, Cancun.
- CBD (2015a), “Global indicators and sub-global approaches to monitor progress in the implementation of the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020”, report for the Ad Hoc

- Technical Expert Group Meeting on Indicators for the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity, Geneva, 14-17 September 2015, [www.cbd.int/doc/meetings/ind/id-ahteg-2015-01/official/id-ahteg-2015-01-02-rev1-en.pdf](http://www.cbd.int/doc/meetings/ind/id-ahteg-2015-01/official/id-ahteg-2015-01-02-rev1-en.pdf).
- Conservation International (2015), “Monitoring natural capital and human well-being in Madagascar: National indicators for sustainable development”, Conservation International, Arlington, Va.
- Davies, T.E. et al. (2013), “Missing the trees for the wood: Why we are failing to see success in pro-poor conservation”, *Animal Conservation*, Vol. 17/4, Zoological Society of London, pp. 303-312, <https://doi.org/10.1111/acv.12094>.
- Drutschinin, A. et al. (2015), “Biodiversity and development co-operation”, *OECD Development Co-operation Working Papers*, No. 21, OECD Publishing, Paris, <http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/5js1sqkvts0v-en>.
- GEF Secretariat (2016), “Biodiversity mainstreaming in practice: A review of GEF experience”, Global Environmental Facility, Washington, DC.
- Horsch, K. (1997), “Indicators: Definition and use in a results-based accountability system”, *Reaching Results*, Harvard Family Research Project, Harvard Graduate School of Education.
- Huntley, B.J. and K.H. Redford (2014), “Mainstreaming biodiversity in practice: A STAP advisory document”, GEF, Washington, DC, [www.cbd.int/doc/case-studies/inc/Mainstreaming-Biodiversity-LowRes.pdf](http://www.cbd.int/doc/case-studies/inc/Mainstreaming-Biodiversity-LowRes.pdf).
- Narlof, U., T. Kozluk and A. Lloyd (2016), “Measuring inclusive green growth at the country level: Taking stock of measurement approaches and indicators”, GGKP (Green Growth Knowledge Platform) Research Committee on Measurement & Indicators, Working Paper 02/2016, United Nations Environment Programme, Geneva.
- OECD (2017), *Green Growth Indicators 2017*, OECD Green Growth Studies, OECD Publishing, Paris, <http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/9789264268586-en>.
- OECD (2015a), “Biodiversity and Development: Mainstreaming and Managing for Results”, OECD Workshop Co-chairs’ Summary, 18 February 2015, [www.oecd.org/dac/environment-development/Biodiversity%20and%20Development%20Workshop%20Co-Chairs%20Summary\\_FINAL\\_clean.pdf](http://www.oecd.org/dac/environment-development/Biodiversity%20and%20Development%20Workshop%20Co-Chairs%20Summary_FINAL_clean.pdf).
- OECD (2015b), *National Climate Change Adaptation: Emerging Practices in Monitoring and Evaluation*, OECD Publishing, Paris, <http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/9789264229679-en>.
- OECD (2013), *Policy Instruments to Support Green Growth in Agriculture*, OECD Green Growth Studies, OECD Publishing, Paris, <http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/9789264203525-en>.
- OECD (2011), *Towards Green Growth: Monitoring Progress: OECD Indicators*, OECD Green Growth Studies, OECD Publishing, Paris, <http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/9789264111356-en>.
- OECD (2002), *Evaluation and Aid Effectiveness No. 6 – Glossary of Key Terms in Evaluation and Results Based Management (in English, French and Spanish)*, OECD Publishing, Paris, <http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/9789264034921-en-fr>.
- Prip, C. et al. (2010), *Biodiversity Planning: An Assessment of National Biodiversity Strategies and Action Plans*, United Nations University Institute of Advanced Studies, Yokohama, Japan.

- Roe, D. (2010), “Linking biodiversity conservation and poverty alleviation: A state of knowledge review”, *CBD Technical Series*, No. 55, Secretariat of the Convention on Biological Diversity, Montreal, [www.cbd.int/doc/publications/cbd-ts-55-en.pdf](http://www.cbd.int/doc/publications/cbd-ts-55-en.pdf).
- Sainteny, G. et al. (2012), *Public Incentives that Harm Biodiversity*, Centre d’analyse strategique, Paris.
- Scheerens, J. et al. (2011), *Perspectives on Educational Quality: Illustrative Outcomes on Primary and Secondary Schooling in the Netherlands*, Springer Netherlands.
- Thomas, J. (2014), “Defining and assessing success in mainstreaming”, Background Paper, IIED (International Institute for Environment and Development), London, <http://pubs.iied.org/pdfs/G03828.pdf>.
- UNICEF (2003), “M&E Training Modules”, Section 2.3: Indicators, [www.ceecis.org/remf/Service3/unicef\\_eng/module2/index.html](http://www.ceecis.org/remf/Service3/unicef_eng/module2/index.html).
- UNPEI (2011), *Mainstreaming Environment and Climate for Poverty Reduction and Sustainable Development: A Handbook to Strengthen Planning and Budgeting Processes*, UNDP (United Nations Development Programme)-UNEP Poverty Environment Initiative, [www.unpei.org/sites/default/files/publications/PEI%20handbook-low%20res.pdf](http://www.unpei.org/sites/default/files/publications/PEI%20handbook-low%20res.pdf).
- UNPEI (2007), “Guidance note on environmental mainstreaming into national development planning”, UNPEI, Nairobi, [www.cbd.int/doc/meetings/nbsap/nbsapcbw-seasi-01/other/nbsapcbw-seasi-01-undp-unep-guide-en.pdf/](http://www.cbd.int/doc/meetings/nbsap/nbsapcbw-seasi-01/other/nbsapcbw-seasi-01-undp-unep-guide-en.pdf/).

## **ORGANISATION FOR ECONOMIC CO-OPERATION AND DEVELOPMENT**

The OECD is a unique forum where governments work together to address the economic, social and environmental challenges of globalisation. The OECD is also at the forefront of efforts to understand and to help governments respond to new developments and concerns, such as corporate governance, the information economy and the challenges of an ageing population. The Organisation provides a setting where governments can compare policy experiences, seek answers to common problems, identify good practice and work to co-ordinate domestic and international policies.

The OECD member countries are: Australia, Austria, Belgium, Canada, Chile, Colombia, the Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Korea, Latvia, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Mexico, the Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Poland, Portugal, the Slovak Republic, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, Turkey, the United Kingdom and the United States. The European Union takes part in the work of the OECD.

OECD Publishing disseminates widely the results of the Organisation's statistics gathering and research on economic, social and environmental issues, as well as the conventions, guidelines and standards agreed by its members.

# Mainstreaming Biodiversity for Sustainable Development

The need to mainstream biodiversity into economic growth and development is being increasingly recognised and is now also firmly embedded in the Sustainable Development Goals. Drawing on experiences and insights from 16 predominantly megadiverse countries, this report examines how biodiversity is being mainstreamed in four key areas: 1) at the national level, including national development plans and other strategies, institutional co-ordination and national budgets; 2) the agriculture, forestry and fisheries sectors; 3) in development co-operation; and 4) the monitoring and evaluation of biodiversity mainstreaming and how this could be improved.

Consult this publication on line at <https://doi.org/10.1787/9789264303201-en>.

This work is published on the OECD iLibrary, which gathers all OECD books, periodicals and statistical databases. Visit [www.oecd-ilibrary.org](http://www.oecd-ilibrary.org) for more information.





**From:**  
**Mainstreaming Biodiversity for Sustainable Development**

**Access the complete publication at:**  
<https://doi.org/10.1787/9789264303201-en>

**Please cite this chapter as:**

OECD (2018), "Foreword", in *Mainstreaming Biodiversity for Sustainable Development*, OECD Publishing, Paris.

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1787/9789264303201-1-en>

This work is published under the responsibility of the Secretary-General of the OECD. The opinions expressed and arguments employed herein do not necessarily reflect the official views of OECD member countries.

This document and any map included herein are without prejudice to the status of or sovereignty over any territory, to the delimitation of international frontiers and boundaries and to the name of any territory, city or area.

You can copy, download or print OECD content for your own use, and you can include excerpts from OECD publications, databases and multimedia products in your own documents, presentations, blogs, websites and teaching materials, provided that suitable acknowledgment of OECD as source and copyright owner is given. All requests for public or commercial use and translation rights should be submitted to [rights@oecd.org](mailto:rights@oecd.org). Requests for permission to photocopy portions of this material for public or commercial use shall be addressed directly to the Copyright Clearance Center (CCC) at [info@copyright.com](mailto:info@copyright.com) or the Centre français d'exploitation du droit de copie (CFC) at [contact@cfcopies.com](mailto:contact@cfcopies.com).