



## Convention on Biological Diversity

Distr.  
GENERAL

UNEP/CBD/COP/12/INF/32  
5 October 2014

ENGLISH ONLY

### CONFERENCE OF THE PARTIES TO THE CONVENTION ON BIOLOGICAL DIVERSITY

Twelfth meeting

Pyeongchang, Republic of Korea, 6-17 October 2014

Item 13 of the provisional agenda\*

### ANALYSIS OF CONTENTS OF THE REVISED NATIONAL BIODIVERSITY STRATEGIES AND ACTION PLANS (NBSAPs)

*Note by the Executive Secretary*

#### I. INTRODUCTION

1. The present note presents the key findings from an internal analysis of the revised (post-2010) national biodiversity strategies and action plans submitted to the Secretariat by 1 September 2014. It complements the update on progress in revising/updating and implementing national biodiversity strategies and action plans, including national targets, and fifth national report submissions document (UNEP/CBD/COP/12/10/Rev.1). The analysis is based on 29 NBSAPs received by 1 September 2014<sup>1</sup> considering the following categories: (a) basic information; (b) revision process; (c) components of the NBSAP; and (d) mainstreaming.

#### II. KEY FINDINGS FROM ANALYSIS OF NBSAPS

##### A. Basic information

2. While 20 of the documents<sup>1</sup> that have been received are national biodiversity strategies and action plans, nine documents<sup>2</sup> submitted are strategy or policy documents pending the development of action plans<sup>2</sup>.

3. The timelines of the NBSAPs submitted to date vary, 17 of them<sup>3</sup> cover periods up until 2020, six<sup>4</sup> cover periods up until 2015 and 2018, one (Guatemala) covers up to 2022 and another one (Australia) covers up to 2030.

#### Adoption as Policy Instrument

4. The text of Target 17 as well as the text of decision X/2 request that Parties adopt their revised NBSAPs as a policy instrument. The intent is to enable NBSAPs to become “whole-of-government” policies thus facilitating the mainstreaming of biodiversity into all sectors of society and decision making.

<sup>1</sup> The NBSAPs reviewed for this analysis are those of: Australia, Belarus, Belgium, Burkina Faso, Cameroon, Colombia, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Dominica, Dominican Republic, El Salvador, Estonia, European Union, Finland, France, Guatemala, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Malta, Myanmar, Nepal, Serbia, Spain, Suriname, Switzerland, Timor-Leste, Tuvalu, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, and Venezuela.

<sup>2</sup> All of these documents are considered NBSAPs and for the purpose of this document, the Secretariat refers to them as such.

5. Based on the information available to date, 10 NBSAPs<sup>5</sup> have been adopted as “whole-of-government” instruments. For example:

- (a) Spain’s NBSAP has been adopted by Royal Decree;
- (b) The NBSAP of Japan, Myanmar and Tuvalu were adopted/endorsed by Cabinet;
- (c) The Council of Ministers of Belarus approved the NBSAP.

6. Three NBSAPs<sup>6</sup> have been adopted as instruments applying to the environment sector:

(a) Australia’s Biodiversity Conservation Strategy was adopted by the Government and it functions as a policy “umbrella” over other more specific environmental national frameworks. It is also a guiding policy framework for the diverse mix of Australian, state, territory and local government and private sector approaches to biodiversity conservation.

(b) Dominican Republic – The resolution approving the NBSAP as a public policy for the environment sector, instructs the Ministry of Environment and Natural Resources to incorporate the strategy in all its plans, projects and planned activities.

(c) Guatemala – The Council of Protected Areas approves the NBSAP as a Resolution with instructions to use it as a policy instrument to implement the National Biodiversity Policy of Guatemala.

7. Three NBSAPs<sup>7</sup> serve as guidance or framework documents. For example:

(a) Belgium’s NBSAP offers a framework in terms of the policy to follow and the subsequent implementing actions to be developed;

(b) El Salvador’s NBSAP provides a framework and specific guidance on actions related to environment;

(c) The NBSAP of Timor-Leste is a guiding policy framework for district and sub-district authorities, civil society and the private sector in their approaches to biodiversity conservation and ecosystems management.

8. The remaining NBSAPs<sup>8</sup> do not provide sufficient information to know if they have been adopted as a policy instrument, or, if they have been, what type of instruments they are.

## ***B. Revision process***

### **Assessment of Previous NBSAP**

9. Eleven of the Parties<sup>9</sup> that have submitted a revised (post 2010) NBSAP mention having done an assessment<sup>3</sup> of their previous NBSAP. For example:

(a) Australia assessed the 1996 NBSAP and the National Objectives and Targets (2001-2005), some of the results were: (i) the NBSAP is relevant to the national biodiversity conservation policy; (ii) there is consistency between the strategy and subnational biodiversity strategies; (c) the National Objectives and Targets are a useful record of national biodiversity conservation priorities and policy directions but need to be more specific; (iv) public awareness of the NBSAP and the Targets was low; (vii) a revised strategy should contain measurable targets;

(b) An assessment of the national implementation of Cameroon’s 2000 NBSAP highlighted that the strategy served as an effective platform for monitoring national progress and reporting under its commitments to the CBD, however it highlighted a weak appropriation of the document by key stakeholders;

(c) In Dominica, 30 per cent of the objectives of the NBSAP 2011-2005, were achieved. Between 2005 and 2013, national consciousness of biodiversity increased, and 60% of the expected results were achieved;

---

<sup>3</sup> This includes assessments of implementation of relevance to the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020, among others.

(d) France had an internal analysis by the focal points of the action plans, and an external assessment by the General Administration Inspection. France produced a report on the Governance of the NBSAP, as well as "The National Biodiversity Strategy: assessment and perspectives, June 2010", one of the results highlighted in this assessment was the lack of awareness of the strategy to most citizens, economic and social stakeholders.

### Stakeholder Engagement

10. Most Parties reported the involvement of a range of stakeholders in the NBSAP revision process. The government ministries that were more commonly involved were: Agriculture, Fisheries, Forestry, Education, Development/Planning and Trade and Industry. Other Ministries involved included: Economy, Finance, Infrastructure/Transport, Culture, Tourism, Science and Technology, Social Affairs, Health, and Sports (see table 1).

**Table 1**

Agriculture	Fisheries	Forestry	Education	Dev. Planning	Trade & Industry	Economy	Finance	Infrastruc/ Transport	Culture	Tourism	Science & Tech	Social affairs	Health	Sports
					3									
1		1	1		1	1	1					1		1
3	3	3			3			3		3	1		3	3
1	1	1												
				3							3	3		
	2	2	2						2				2	
2	1			1			2							
1	1	1	1	1		1		1	1	1				
1			1			1	1		1					
			1		1									
1			1				1	1	1	1		1	1	1
1	1	1	1		1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
1	1	1		1										
3		3		3	3		3	3			3			
1	1			1		1								
											2			
		2												
1	1			1	2	1				2				

on committee	1	consulted	2	will implement	3
--------------	---	-----------	---	----------------	---

11. Parties also reported the involvement of other stakeholders in the revision process. These include indigenous and local communities (reported on 7 NBSAPs<sup>10</sup>), NGOs/Civil Society (14 NBSAPs<sup>11</sup>), private sector (9 NBSAPs<sup>12</sup>) and Academia (9 NBSAPs<sup>13</sup>).

## Coordination Structures

12. Of the Parties that revised their NBSAPs, 16<sup>14</sup> report having a formal coordination structure, or a working group for NBSAP related tasks, composed of different stakeholders. The role of these coordination structures vary. For example:

(a) The committees/working groups of Ireland, Japan and Timor-Leste were/are responsible for reviewing/updating, monitoring and for overseeing implementation;

(b) The committees/working groups of Australia, Belarus, Belgium, Cameroon, Dominica, Dominican Republic, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Myanmar and Tuvalu were responsible for the preparation of the NBSAP; but only Belgium and France explicitly mention a role for the committees/working groups after NBSAP adoption, for overseeing implementation and for monitoring respectively;

(c) Nepal has a National Biodiversity Coordination Committee composed by Government (several Ministries), academic sectors, independent sectors, NGOs and ILCs, with the purpose of coordinating and monitoring biodiversity related programmes at the national level;

(d) Malta and Suriname are considering establishing formal coordination mechanisms responsible for implementation. Other Parties mention different stakeholders responsible or otherwise involved in implementation of their strategy; however, there is no indication of how they are coordinated or structured.

## Clearing-house mechanism

13. Three countries<sup>15</sup> reported having used their National Clearing House Mechanism in the preparation of their NBSAP: Belgium, European Union and Japan.

14. A total of 20 countries<sup>16</sup> have a national clearing house mechanism or similar; 10 out of these<sup>17</sup> mention their intention to improve and enhance their current system. Of the rest, six<sup>18</sup> have actions and/or plans to establish a national clearing-house mechanism. The other three do not mention any action on the elaboration of a national CHM.

## C. Components

### Resource Mobilization Strategies

15. Decision XI/14 paragraph 25, encourages Parties to “to develop, as appropriate, country-specific resource mobilization strategies, including assessment of resource needs, as part of their updated national biodiversity strategies and action plans”. In this regard, Belgium and Timor-Leste specifically mention having a National Resource Mobilization Strategy or equivalent.

16. Twenty-three of the revised NBSAPs<sup>19</sup> include some mention of resource mobilization, including seven<sup>20</sup> that have intentions for the future development of resource mobilization plans. For example:

(a) Australia has a sub-priority to enhance strategic investments and partnerships in order to increase private expenditure on biodiversity conservation;

(b) Guatemala's Strategic Objective 2 is to strengthen the management of financial resources to implement the NBSAP. This objective has four actions, among them, the development of a resource mobilization strategy and the development of a National Incentives Program for the conservation of biodiversity, and guidance on the articulation of national budget and biodiversity;

(c) The United Kingdom has a priority action to “Develop new and innovative financing mechanisms to direct more funding towards the achievement of biodiversity outcomes” and have set various activities under this action;

17. Seven of the NBSAPs submitted include fully-costed Action Plans: Burkina Faso, Dominica, Estonia, Guatemala, Nepal, Suriname and Spain;

18. Seven Parties<sup>21</sup> have set national targets in relation to Aichi Target 20 on resource mobilization:

(a) Cameroon - National Target 20: “By 2020, partnership support and funding of biodiversity programs should have increased”. More specifically, action 20.3 refers to the implementation of a resource mobilization strategy and a plan to increase funding for biodiversity;

(b) Dominican Republic - National Target 20: “By 2016, a national financing campaign for supporting NBSAP implementation, with a view to achieving the goals of the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity (2011-2020), has been undertaken”;

(c) Objective 15 of Belgium’s NBSAP is to ensure the provision of adequate resources for biodiversity and is linked to Aichi Biodiversity Target 20. This national objective has 4 actions. Objective 15.1 “By 2020 at the latest, the mobilization of financial resources for biodiversity from all sources (including possible innovative financial mechanisms), should increase substantially compared to the average annual biodiversity funding for the years 2006-2010”;

(d) The European Union’s NBSAP (Target 6, action 18) makes reference to the mobilization of additional resources, stating that the Commission and Member States will contribute their fair share to international efforts to significantly increase resources for global biodiversity;

(e) Finland – Target 20 - By 2020, Finland assesses opportunities to increase the availability of financial, human and technical resources to facilitate the effective implementation of the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020 as drawn up at CBD COP 10 and in line with decisions made at COP 11. Finland strives to obtain resources from all appropriate sources in accordance with the consolidated and agreed process defined in the Strategy for Resource Mobilization;

(f) Japan – Target E-2 “...Effectively and efficiently mobilize the resources (funds, human resources, technologies, etc.) needed to achieve the Aichi Biodiversity Targets by 2020 at the latest”;

(g) Serbia – Objective 4.4: Strengthen and expand financing for biodiversity conservation and provide incentives for biodiversity conservation within all sectors; Objective 11.1: Ensure a diverse portfolio of sources and strategies for the long-term funding of the Strategy. Ensure that the costs of biological diversity conservation are shared equitably among institutions and stakeholders so that they reflect contributions to degradation and benefits from protection or use.

### **Communication, education and public awareness**

19. Three countries have developed a CEPA strategy and action plan or equivalent:

(a) Timor-Leste developed a CEPA strategy and action plan which consists of a goal, specific objectives and target audiences;

(b) Guatemala has an awareness and valuation strategy with 2 strategic objectives, each one of these with several actions;

(c) Nepal has a Communication, Extension and Outreach Implementation Action Plan with actions, target audiences and lead roles. In addition, the NBSAP identifies the expected outcomes for each of the key target audiences, the messages to be communicated, as well as the tools and platforms to be used.

20. Twelve of the NBSAPs<sup>22</sup> (including Timor-Leste) have set national targets and/or objectives in relation to Aichi Biodiversity Target 1. For example:

(a) Japan set a National Target mapped to Aichi Target 1: “Achieving the mainstreaming of biodiversity across society”, enhancing publicity, education, and public awareness on biodiversity;

(b) Malta’s National Target 1 states that “By 2020, more than 55% of Maltese citizens are aware of the term “biodiversity”, know what it means and also know what steps they can take to conserve and use biodiversity in a sustainable manner”;

(c) Serbia covers CEPA under Objective 8.1 which consists of a wide range of activities: develop and implement modules, campaigns, web portals on raising public awareness, academic programmes and courses, communication systems and training;

(d) One of the Objectives of Belgium's NBSAP is to involve the community through communication, education, public awareness and training. More specifically the objective: (i) strives to include biodiversity and its ecosystem services in education programs; (ii) promotes understanding of the importance of biodiversity; and (iii) raises awareness among and provide thematic training courses for the sectors that impact biodiversity;

(e) Ireland's NBSAP has an objective to increase awareness and appreciation of biodiversity and ecosystem services. It showcases various campaigns and programs such as "Notice Nature" and "Green Schools" and has a section on future actions and activities, along with indicators and expected outcomes;

(f) Estonia's NBSAP has three overarching goals, the first of which aspires that by 2020 "People are familiar with, appreciate and conserve nature and know how to use their knowledge in their everyday lives".

### Capacity development<sup>4</sup>

21. Three NBSAPs, those of Dominican Republic, Suriname and Timor-Leste include a national capacity development plan. Eight other countries<sup>23</sup> list several capacity-building activities, some of which also indicate the budget allocated as well as the entity in charge of the activity.

22. All except one developing country (Belarus) list capacity needs for implementing their NBSAPs. Table 2 below indicates the areas in which Parties have expressed capacity needs in their NBSAPs, and the frequency of their mention.

**Table 2**

Capacity needs outlined in post-Nagoya NBSAPs "Implementation"	Out of 13 developing countries, number of countries that expressed this need in revised NBSAP (%)
General (conservation / sustainable development)	46%
Protected areas	46%
Education / awareness / outreach	46%
Genetic resources	31%
Monitoring	31%
Fisheries	31%
Research / Scientific information	23%
Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA)	23%
Resource Mobilization	23%
Valuation	15%
Invasive Alien Species (IAS)	15%
Biosafety / Biotechnology	15%
Forestry	15%
Indigenous and local communities & Traditional Knowledge	7%
Marine	7%
Spatial planning / Land use	7%
Alternative technologies / Technology transfer	7%
Agriculture	7%
Access & Benefit Sharing (ABS)	7%
Project formulation	7%

<sup>4</sup> This subsection only reports on the capacity needs for implementation expressed in the revised (post 2010) NBSAPs of developing countries submitted by WGRI 5. 13 NBSAPs were analysed (Belarus, Cameroon, Colombia, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Dominica, Dominican Republic, El Salvador, Myanmar, Serbia, Suriname, Timor-Leste, Tuvalu and Venezuela).

### ***D. Mainstreaming***

#### **Valuation of Biodiversity and Ecosystem Services**

23. Four Parties<sup>24</sup> report having conducted a valuation of the biodiversity in their countries, or parts thereof. There is not enough information however to determine if the results from these exercises have been significantly considered in setting priorities, mainstreaming and/or developing the revised NBSAP. Some examples of valuation studies conducted include:

(a) The European Union has considered studies undertaken by TEEB and by FAO concerning values of biodiversity, as a basis to develop the NBSAP;

(b) Colombia conducted some pilot valuation studies and has also started to assess other (non-economic) values of biodiversity; neither has yet been used in decision making;

(c) Malta documented the results of the existing biodiversity valuation in the “Malta State of the Environment Report” issued by the Malta Environment and Planning Authority;

(d) An example of valuation exercise of a specific area is the economic valuation study that El Salvador conducted in La Union bay, to evaluate the profitability of salt pans and shrimp production.

24. Fourteen of the NBSAPs<sup>25</sup> state the importance, and/or the intention of conducting such studies in the future. For example :

(a) Belarus, Estonia, and Italy have the development of tools and methods for the valuation of biodiversity and ecosystem services as part of their action plans. In addition, Belgium is currently developing methodologies to value biodiversity and ecosystem services, including the ecological aspects related to ecosystem structure and functions, the social-economic aspects and the monetary aspects;

(b) Guatemala will carry out economic valuation studies of damaged ecosystems and ecosystems in need of restoration; and will also generate mechanisms to disseminate the results;

(c) Ireland will carry out further and more detailed research on the economic value of ecosystems and biodiversity with a view to integrate economic values into national accounting processes;

(d) Nepal plans to initiate TEEB studies for forest, mountains, wetlands and agriculture sectors. In addition, it intends to develop a system for economic valuation of ecosystem services provided by the country’s protected areas;

(e) Suriname has assigned high priority to determining the current and potential value of forest biodiversity and intends to conduct studies in this regard in the short term (1-2 years).

25. Six countries have set national targets on valuation. For example:

(a) Belgium’s Objective 5.11 is mapped to Aichi Target 2 and it states the following: “Integrate biodiversity values into national (federal and regional) policies, programmes, planning processes and reporting systems, and develop an approach to support incorporation into national accounting if needed”;

(b) Cameroon, Target 14: “By 2020, the development and implementation of a comprehensive program for the valuation of biodiversity should have been realised and payments for ecosystem services and goods imputed into the national budget for use in promoting sustainable biological and genetic resources”;

(c) Dominican Republic, Target 2: “By 2016, biodiversity values will be strengthened in national planning processes and budget allocations”;

(d) Estonia’s Measure 3.1.3 aims that by 2020 the values of ecosystem services are assessed and taken into account in national and local decision-making processes and reporting systems;

(e) Guatemala, Target 2: “By 2015, valuation mechanisms for biodiversity and ecosystem services will be implanted considering valuation as a national priority for integral intergenerational human development”;

(f) Switzerland, Strategic Goal 6: “By 2020, ecosystem services are recorded quantitatively. This enables their consideration in the measurement of welfare as complementary indicators to gross domestic product and in regulatory impact assessments.”

### **Spatial planning**

26. A total of 14 of the revised NBSAPs<sup>26</sup> include items on spatial planning and/or land use planning in their action plans. Some are seeking to take advantage of opportunities in the development or revision of national spatial plans or the equivalent to include biodiversity considerations. Several others are using spatial planning, or a landscape approach to support biodiversity planning and mainstreaming. For example:

(a) Action S16 of Malta’s NBSAP refers to incorporating biodiversity into new policy on spatial planning;

(b) One of the actions in Dominican Republic’s NBSAP is to support the development of a national land use plan;

(c) Timor-Leste has a national target to develop and enforce a sustainable land management and land use policy;

(d) France promotes the development of green and blue infrastructure: a structural approach which consists of including the preservation and restoration of ecological continuities in spatial planning decisions. It includes a green component, which refers to natural and semi-natural terrestrial environments, and a blue component, which refers to the aquatic and wetland network (rivers and streams, wetlands, etc.);

(e) Belgium: One action item (7.1.1) of Belgium’s NBSAP intends to define requirements for spatial planning instruments to ensure that both landscape and biodiversity are addressed in sectoral plans. Also, the designation of the marine protected areas will be backed up by a legally binding Marine Spatial Planning (MSP) which will take into account the views of the socio-economic sectors and Integrated Coastal Zone Management;

(f) Nepal’s Tenth Five Year Plan (2003-2008) incorporated the landscape approach as a new strategic and operational direction to conservation and sustainable use of biological resources. Accordingly Nepal has been implementing landscape-based programmes in various or its key landscapes.

(g) One strategic axis of Guatemala’s NBSAP is on sustainable productive landscapes and land use planning for sustainable development;

(h) In Estonia, National level spatial planning of marine areas has commenced. In addition, Measure 2.5.3 of the NBSAP intends to make spatial (and other) data available.

### **National development plans**

27. Five Parties demonstrate that biodiversity has been integrated into their national development plan or equivalent instrument:

(a) Timor Leste’s National Strategic Development Plan (SDP) commits to meeting several of CBD global targets. The implementation of Timor Leste’s NBSAP and its progress reporting will form part of the reporting of achievements of the Sustainable Development Plan;

(b) The Dominican Republic’s NBSAP is linked to the implementation of its National Development Strategy (2010-2030). Actions relating to biodiversity under its strategic objective on sustainable natural resource management are to be carried out by 2016;

(c) Estonia’s government coalition programme has set the objective of developing a responsible attitude towards nature in people and maintaining a clean and biologically diverse living environment supporting the sustainability of the nation;

(d) Venezuela's NBSAP is framed within the country's first Socialist Plan of Economic and Social Development of the Nation (2007-2013);

(e) The strategic goals and priority actions of Burkina Faso's Accelerated Growth and Sustainable Development Strategy 2001-2015 align with the operational objectives of its (previous) NBSAP.

28. Seven other Parties' NBSAPs<sup>27</sup> contain elements and/or targets and actions, which aim at mainstreaming with the national development plan or equivalent instrument.

#### **Sustainable development plans:**

29. Nine Parties<sup>28</sup> mention an integration of their NBSAP with their Sustainable Development plans or equivalent instruments. For example:

(a) Belgium's Second Federal Plan for Sustainable Development contains actions devoted to biodiversity, forests and marine waters;

(b) The European Union intends to use some of its sustainable development and agro-environmental indicators to monitor and report on progress implementing its NBSAP;

(c) France's National Biodiversity Strategy is a major component of the National Sustainable Development Strategy (SNDD).

#### **Subnational level plans**

30. Four NBSAPs<sup>29</sup> contain elements or actions that aim to integrate biodiversity into subnational level plans:

(a) In Australia and Belgium, the actions of the NBSAP are intended to be considered and taken on board in conjunction with regional, state and territory plans/documents;

(b) France's strategy will be incorporated as a priority into all public policy, at every territorial scale and frameworks must be put in place at every level of governance, from the global to the local, and at all these levels;

(c) In order to implement the CBD Plan of Action on Subnational Governments, Cities and Other Local Authorities for Biodiversity (2011-2020), Malta will engage the participation of local councils in supporting the implementation of the NBSAP at the local/subnational level, and will integrate biodiversity considerations into urban infrastructure investments.

31. Four Parties have already started or have plans or preparations to draft subnational level strategies and actions plans. For example:

(a) 18 out of 47 prefectures in Japan, have developed Local Biodiversity Strategies and Action Plans (LBSAPs) by the end of March 2012;

(b) Democratic People's Republic of Korea has a priority to prepare a provincial biodiversity conservation plan, which will be implemented over a three-year period;

(c) In Ireland, 26 Local Biodiversity Action Plans had either been finalised or drafted by 2010;

(d) Nepal's NBSAP presents a framework for Local Biodiversity Strategy and Action Plan (LBSAP) to guide local authorities in developing detailed and specific LBSAPs. The framework also outlines monitoring and funding mechanisms for these subnational plans. The United Kingdom NBSAP seeks to enable local decisions to plan and manage biodiversity.

32. Two Parties have set national targets addressing subnational level plans:

(a) Australia – Target 9 – “By 2015, all jurisdictions will review relevant legislation, policies and programmes to maximise alignment with Australia's Biodiversity Conservation Strategy”;

(b) Cameroon – Target 18 –“By 2020, key production sectors and decentralised local authorities should have developed sector or region-specific biodiversity targets, linked to the national targets”.

### **Ecosystem approach**

33. Seventeen Parties<sup>30</sup> make reference to the Ecosystem Approach in their NBSAPs. Many of these include it among the principles of the NBSAP; a few others have specific targets and actions aiming at its implementation. For example:

(a) Ireland: Action 14.1 under the national target on fisheries – “Continue seeking to ensure the Common Fisheries Policy and marine fisheries provide for the conservation of fish species and marine biodiversity generally and adopt the ecosystem approach to fisheries management”;

(b) Cameroon - The Biodiversity Strategic Goals and Targets have been translated into general actions for interventions with specific ecosystem priorities identified for each Strategic Goal following key guidelines of the ecosystem approach under the CBD;

(c) One of three strategic goals of the Estonian NBSAP is: “Long-term sustainability of natural resources is ensured and the principles of the ecosystem approach are followed in the use of natural resources”.

### **Gender**

34. Seven Parties make reference to gender issues and/or to the involvement of women in biodiversity conservation related actions.

(a) Cameroon, Nepal, and Timor-Leste’s NBSAPs contain targets or actions on gender mainstreaming and the enhanced involvement of women;

(b) The Dominican Republic, Guatemala and Myanmar include gender awareness, or equitable sharing of benefits among women and men, in the principles of their strategy;

(c) Tuvalu includes women as a Key Implementing Stakeholder (KIS) under their thematic area on sustainable use of natural resources.

## Endnotes

<sup>1</sup> Australia, Burkina Faso, Cameroon, Dominica, Dominican Republic, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Estonia, European Union, Guatemala, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Malta, Myanmar, Nepal, Serbia, Spain, Suriname, and Timor-Leste, Tuvalu.

<sup>2</sup> Belarus, Belgium, Colombia, El Salvador, Finland, France, Switzerland, United Kingdom, and Venezuela.

<sup>3</sup> Belarus, Belgium, Cameroon, Dominica, Dominican Republic, Estonia, European Union, Finland, France, Italy, Japan, Malta, Nepal, Switzerland, Timor-Leste, United Kingdom, and Venezuela.

<sup>4</sup> Burkina Faso (2005), Ireland (2016), Serbia (2018), Spain (2017), Suriname (2016), and Tuvalu (2016).

<sup>5</sup> Belarus, Colombia, Finland, Japan, Malta, Myanmar, Serbia, Spain, Switzerland and Tuvalu.

<sup>6</sup> Australia, Dominican Republic and Guatemala.

<sup>7</sup> Belgium, El Salvador, and Timor-Leste.

<sup>8</sup> Burkina Faso, Cameroon, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Dominica, Estonia, European Union, France, Ireland, Italy, Nepal, Suriname, United Kingdom and Venezuela.

<sup>9</sup> Australia, Belgium, Cameroon, Colombia, Dominica, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, France, Ireland, Japan, Nepal and Suriname.

<sup>10</sup> Cameroon, Colombia, Guatemala, Ireland, Japan, Suriname, and Venezuela.

<sup>11</sup> Belarus, Belgium, Cameroon, Colombia, Dominica, Dominican Republic, Estonia, France, Guatemala, Japan, Myanmar, Serbia, Spain, and Timor-Leste.

<sup>12</sup> Cameroon, Colombia, Dominica, Dominican Republic, Estonia, Guatemala, Japan, Spain, and Switzerland.

<sup>13</sup> Colombia, Dominican Republic, Estonia, France, Guatemala, Myanmar, Serbia, Spain, and Timor-Leste.

<sup>14</sup> Australia, Belarus, Belgium, Cameroon, Dominican Republic, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Estonia, France, Ireland, Japan, Myanmar, Nepal, Serbia, Timor-Leste, Tuvalu, and Venezuela.

<sup>15</sup> Belgium, European Union, and Japan.

<sup>16</sup> Australia, Belarus, Belgium, Burkina Faso, Cameroon, Colombia, Dominica, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Estonia, European Union, Guatemala, Italy, Japan, Malta, Myanmar, Nepal, Timor-Leste, United Kingdom, and Venezuela.

<sup>17</sup> Australia, Belgium, Cameroon, Estonia, Guatemala, European Union, Italy, Japan, Malta, United Kingdom, and

---

Venezuela.

<sup>18</sup> Dominica, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Myanmar, Nepal, and Timor-Leste.

<sup>19</sup> Australia, Belgium, Belarus, Cameroon, Colombia, Dominica, Dominican Republic, Estonia, European Union, Finland, France, Guatemala, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Malta, Serbia, Spain, Suriname, Switzerland, Timor-Leste Tuvalu, United Kingdom.

<sup>20</sup> Cameroon, Dominica, Finland, France, Guatemala, Malta, and Serbia.

<sup>21</sup> Belgium, Cameroon, Dominican Republic, European Union, Finland, Japan, and Serbia.

<sup>22</sup> Belgium, Burkina Faso, Estonia, Japan, Ireland, Italy, Malta, Serbia, Spain, Timor-Leste, United Kingdom, and Venezuela.

<sup>23</sup> Burkina Faso, Cameroon, Dominica, Guatemala, Myanmar, Nepal, Serbia, Tuvalu.

<sup>24</sup> Colombia, El Salvador, European Union, and Malta.

<sup>25</sup> Belarus, Belgium, Cameroon, Dominica, Dominican Republic, Estonia, France, Guatemala, Ireland, Italy, Malta, Nepal, Suriname, and Tuvalu.

<sup>26</sup> Belgium, Dominican Republic, Estonia, European Union, Finland, France, Guatemala, Ireland, Italy, Malta, Nepal, Serbia, Switzerland, Timor-Leste

<sup>27</sup> France, Belgium, Cameroon, Ireland, Finland, Colombia, and the United Kingdom.

<sup>28</sup> Belgium, European Union, Estonia, France, Ireland, Myanmar, Serbia, Switzerland, and Timor-Leste.

<sup>29</sup> Australia, Belgium, France, Malta, and United Kingdom.

<sup>30</sup> Australia, Belgium, Cameroon, Colombia, Dominican Republic, Estonia, Finland, France, Guatemala, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Malta, Myanmar, Spain, Timor-Leste, United Kingdom.