



Convention on Biological Diversity

Distr.
GENERAL

UNEP/CBD/COP/13/8/Add.1/Rev.1
24 November 2016*

ORIGINAL: ENGLISH

CONFERENCE OF THE PARTIES TO THE CONVENTION ON BIOLOGICAL DIVERSITY

Thirteenth meeting

Cancun, Mexico, 4-17 December 2016

Item 9 of the provisional agenda**

UPDATE ON PROGRESS IN REVISING/UPDATING AND IMPLEMENTING NATIONAL BIODIVERSITY STRATEGIES AND ACTION PLANS, INCLUDING NATIONAL TARGETS

Note by the Executive Secretary

I. INTRODUCTION

1. National biodiversity strategies and action plans (NBSAPs) are the principal planning tool for the implementation of the Convention at the national level. Article 6 of the Convention on Biological Diversity states that each Contracting Party “shall, in accordance with its particular conditions and capabilities, develop national strategies, plans or programmes for the conservation and sustainable use of biological diversity or adapt for this purpose existing strategies, plans or programmes which shall reflect, inter alia, the measures set out in the Convention relevant to the Contracting Party concerned”. The majority (94%) of Parties have developed at least one NBSAP since they became a Party.
2. In decision X/2, the Conference of the Parties urged Parties to review, revise and update, as appropriate, their NBSAPs in line with the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020. Aichi Biodiversity Target 17, which had a deadline of 2015, calls on Parties to develop and adopt as a policy instrument and commence implementing an effective, participatory and updated NBSAP by 2015. Parties have also committed to establishing national targets, using the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020 and its Aichi Biodiversity Targets as a flexible framework.
3. In decision XI/2, the Conference of the Parties urged Parties and other Governments that had not yet done so to review and, as appropriate, update and revise their NBSAPs in line with the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020, including national plans related to biodiversity and to report thereon to the Conference of the Parties at its twelfth meeting.
4. In decision XII/2, the Conference of the Parties commended those countries that had reviewed and, as appropriate, updated and revised their NBSAPs in line with the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020, adopted relevant indicators and submitted their fifth national reports. The Conference of the Parties also urged countries that had not yet fulfilled these commitments to do so no later than October 2015.

* Reissued on 29 November 2016 for technical reasons.

** UNEP/CBD/COP/13/1.

5. Most recently, in recommendation 1/1, the Subsidiary Body on Implementation urged those Parties that have not yet updated their NBSAPs to do so as soon as possible. The meeting also requested the Executive Secretary to continue to update the analysis of progress towards the implementation of the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020 on the basis of additional NBSAPs and fifth national reports received by 30 June 2016.

6. The present note is updated from a note submitted to the Subsidiary Body on Implementation (UNEP/CBD/SBI/1/2/Add.1) to reflect further national-level activities carried out since the earlier document was prepared and/or that are currently under way, according to information provided by countries and using those NBSAPs that were received by the Secretariat in a United Nations language by 30 September 2016.

7. Progress in the development or revision/updating of NBSAPs is summarized in section II. A summary of progress in establishing national targets, including in relation to achieving the Aichi Biodiversity Targets, is provided in section III. An analysis of the contents of the NBSAPs submitted since the adoption of the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020 is provided in section IV.

II. PROGRESS IN DEVELOPING OR REVISING AND UPDATING NATIONAL BIODIVERSITY STRATEGIES AND ACTION PLANS

8. Since 1993, 189 Parties (96%) have developed at least one NBSAP, while 7 Parties have yet to submit their first. As of 24 November 2016, of the 189 Parties that have prepared NBSAPs, 121 have revised them at least once.

9. Since the tenth meeting of the Conference of the Parties, the majority of Parties have initiated further revisions of their NBSAPs in response to decision X/2. Of the 145 countries eligible for funding from the Global Environment Facility (GEF), 141 have now accessed funds set aside in GEF-5 and GEF-6 for Biodiversity Enabling Activities (49 through UNDP, 84 through UNEP, 1 through FAO, 1 through the Inter-American Development Bank (IADB), and 6 via Direct Access). The total investment in these revision projects to date is US\$ 31,231,908 of the GEF grant (US\$ 30,263,908 in GEF-5 and US\$ 968,000 in GEF-6) and US\$ 53,049,355 in total cash and in-kind co-financing (US\$ 52,219,355 in GEF-5 and US\$ 830,000 in GEF-6). A number of Parties, notably the Government of Japan through its Japan Biodiversity Fund, have provided additional support for the NBSAP revision process.

10. As reported in UNEP/CBD/SBI/1/2/Add.1, by the December 2015 deadline established in Aichi Biodiversity Target 17, 69¹ Parties had submitted an NBSAP prepared or revised/updated after the adoption of the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020. As of 24 November 2016, an additional 62 NBSAPs had been received for a total of 131.² Of this total, 113 Parties submitted revised versions (among these, 2 Parties completed their revisions prior to the tenth meeting of the Conference of the Parties, albeit with consideration given to the draft Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020, and are therefore included in this number); 14 Parties submitted their first NBSAPs; 2 Parties submitted both their

¹ Brunei Darussalam and the Russian Federation had submitted their first and a revised/updated NBSAP, respectively, by the December 2015 deadline, however this information was inadvertently omitted from the total (67) reflected in UNEP/CBD/SBI/1/2/Add.1.

² Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Andorra, Antigua and Barbuda, Armenia, Australia (revised its NBSAP in the light of the preliminary framework of the Strategic Plan but considers it to be in line with the final Strategy adopted at the tenth meeting of the Conference of the Parties), Austria, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Belarus, Belgium, Benin, Bhutan, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cabo Verde, Cambodia, Cameroon, Canada, Chad, China, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Czechia, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Denmark, Dominica, Dominican Republic, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Eritrea, Estonia, Ethiopia, European Union, Finland, France, Gambia, Georgia, Germany, Greece, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Hungary, India, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Jordan, Kiribati, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Latvia, Lebanon, Liechtenstein, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nauru, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Niue, Norway, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Russian Federation, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Samoa, Senegal, Serbia, Seychelles, Slovakia, Solomon Islands, Somalia, South Africa, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Sweden, Switzerland, Tajikistan, Thailand, Timor-Leste, Tonga, Togo, Tuvalu, Uganda, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Zambia and Zimbabwe.

first NBSAP and a revised version; 1 Party submitted an Action Plan to 2020 for enhancing implementation of its Strategy adopted before the tenth meeting of the Conference of the Parties; and 1 Party submitted a first NBSAP developed in 2010 prior to the tenth meeting of the Conference of the Parties. The current status of NBSAP preparation and revision/updating, as reported informally to the Secretariat, is as follows:

NBSAP preparation and revision/updating status as of 24 November 2016

NBSAPs submitted to the Secretariat	131
NBSAPs completed but not submitted (pending final approval)	6
NBSAP under preparation	48
Have not started yet	4
No plans to update NBSAP in the near future	4
No information	3
Total	196

11. It is important to recognize that many of the NBSAPs finalized prior to the adoption of the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020 contain elements which are nonetheless in line with the Plan and form the basis of the progress reported in the fifth national reports.

III. PROGRESS IN THE ESTABLISHMENT OF NATIONAL TARGETS IN RELATION TO ACHIEVING THE AICHI BIODIVERSITY TARGETS

12. In decision X/2, the Conference of the Parties urged Parties and other Governments to develop national and regional targets, using the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020 and its Aichi Biodiversity Targets as a flexible framework, in accordance with national priorities and capacities and the status and trends of biological diversity in the country, and resources provided through the strategy for resource mobilization, while also bearing in mind national contributions to the achievement of the global targets, and to report progress to the eleventh meeting of the Conference of the Parties. Very few Parties were able to do so by that time, but the number has increased since then.

13. The Secretariat has been compiling a database of all “targets”³ presented in NBSAPs, fifth national reports or separate documents submitted since the tenth meeting of the Conference of the Parties. As of 24 November 2016, the database contains 3,036 separate “targets” and the number will continue to increase as more Parties submit NBSAPs. Wherever national targets have been mapped to the global targets by the Party concerned, this is represented in the database. To date, 78 Parties⁴ have done so. Further analysis of national targets is provided in the updated analysis of the contribution of targets established by Parties and progress towards the Aichi Biodiversity Targets (UNEP/CBD/COP/13/8/Add.2).

IV. ANALYSIS OF CONTENTS OF THE NBSAPS RECEIVED AFTER ADOPTION OF THE STRATEGIC PLAN FOR BIODIVERSITY 2011-2020

14. This section presents key findings from an internal analysis of 110 NBSAPs submitted to the Secretariat, in a United Nations language, between the adoption of the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity

³ For the full set, see <https://www.cbd.int/nbsap/targets/default.shtml>. Note that the definition and use of the term “target” is quite varied among Parties. In the database, all “achievable” measures in an NBSAP have been included as “targets”, even if the NBSAP itself uses a different term, such as “objective”, “action” or “work area”.

⁴ Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Andorra, Antigua and Barbuda, Bahrain, Belarus, Belgium, Bhutan, Botswana, Brazil, Cabo Verde, Cambodia, Cameroon, Canada, China, Comoros, Côte d’Ivoire, Cuba, Czechia, Denmark, Egypt, Ethiopia, France, Gambia, Georgia, Greece, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, India, Iraq, Ireland, Japan, Kiribati, Lao People’s Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Luxembourg, Malawi, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Myanmar, Namibia, New Zealand, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Peru, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Russian Federation, Rwanda, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, Seychelles, Slovakia, Slovenia, Solomon Islands, South Africa, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Sweden, Switzerland, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Timor-Leste, Togo, Uganda, Ukraine, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, Uganda, Uruguay, Viet Nam and Zimbabwe.

2011-2020 and 30 September 2016.⁵ This analysis is based on the NBSAP guidance adopted in decision IX/8 and considers the following categories: (a) basic information; (b) revision process; (c) components of the NBSAP; and (d) mainstreaming. The information in the analysis is taken from the contents of the NBSAPs, unless otherwise indicated. A limited number of examples are provided to illustrate each category and subcategory of the analysis.

A. Basic information

15. NBSAPs have been submitted to the Secretariat in various forms. While 85 of the documents⁶ are national biodiversity strategies and action plans (NBSAPs), 20 are strategy or policy documents.⁷ Seven of the Parties⁸ that have submitted these strategy documents intend to develop action plans. For the purpose of this analysis, all of these documents are considered NBSAPs and the Secretariat refers to them as such.

16. The timelines of the NBSAPs submitted to date also vary. While 9 NBSAPs⁹ cover periods between 2015 and 2018, 62 cover periods up to 2020¹⁰ and 28 others cover periods up to 2030.¹¹

Adoption as policy instrument

17. 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.

⁵ This analysis has been updated to include NBSAPs received after 31 December 2015. The analysis is based in the information contained in the NBSAPs and comments received during and after the first meeting of the Subsidiary Body on Implementation. The NBSAPs that were analysed were those from: Afghanistan, Albania, Antigua and Barbuda, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Bahrain, Belarus, Belgium, Benin, Bhutan, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brunei Darussalam, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cabo Verde, Cambodia, Cameroon, Canada, Chad, China, Comoros, Congo, Côte d'Ivoire, Czechia, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Denmark, Dominica, Dominican Republic, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Eritrea, Estonia, Ethiopia, European Union, Finland, France, Gambia, Georgia, Germany, Greece, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Hungary, India, Iraq, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Jordan, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Liechtenstein, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Netherlands, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Niue, Norway, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Russian Federation, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Samoa, Senegal, Serbia, Seychelles, Slovakia, South Africa, Spain, Sudan, Suriname, Sweden, Switzerland, Timor-Leste, Togo, Tuvalu, Uganda, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Zambia, and Zimbabwe.

⁶ Afghanistan, Albania, Antigua and Barbuda, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Bahrain, Benin, Bhutan, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cabo Verde, Cambodia, Cameroon, Chad, China, Comoros, Congo, Côte d'Ivoire, Dominica, Dominican Republic, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Egypt, Equatorial Guinea, Eritrea, Estonia, Ethiopia, European Union, Finland, Gambia, Guinea-Bissau, Georgia, Greece, Grenada, Guatemala, Guyana, Ireland, Iraq, Italy, Japan, Jordan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Liechtenstein, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Nicaragua, Namibia, Nepal, Niger, Nigeria, Niue, Norway, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Russian Federation, Qatar, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Samoa, Senegal, Serbia, Seychelles, South Africa, Spain, Sudan, Timor-Leste, Togo, Tuvalu, Uganda, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Zambia and Zimbabwe.

⁷ Belarus, Belgium, Brunei Darussalam, Czechia, Colombia, Denmark, El Salvador, France, Guinea, Hungary, Kyrgyzstan, Mauritania, Netherlands, Slovakia, Sweden, Switzerland, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom, Venezuela and Viet Nam.

⁸ Belarus, Colombia, El Salvador, Finland, Slovakia, Venezuela and Switzerland.

⁹ Afghanistan (2014-2017), Burkina Faso (Action Plan 2015), Ireland (2016), Peru (2018), Republic of Korea (2018), Serbia (2018), Spain (2017), Suriname (2016), and Tuvalu (2016).

¹⁰ Antigua and Barbuda, Austria, Belarus, Belgium, Benin, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Burundi, Cambodia, Cameroon, Canada, Chad, Comoros, Côte d'Ivoire, Dominica, Dominican Republic, Eritrea, Estonia, Ethiopia, European Union, Finland, France, Gambia, Georgia, Germany, Grenada, Guyana, Guinea-Bissau, Kyrgyzstan, India, Iraq, Italy, Japan, Jordan, Liechtenstein, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Morocco, Nepal, Netherlands, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Poland, Republic of Moldova, Russian Federation, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Samoa, Senegal, Seychelles, Slovakia, Sudan, Sweden, Switzerland, Timor-Leste, Togo, United Kingdom, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Zimbabwe.

¹¹ Australia (2030), Bahrain (2021), Botswana (2025), Brunei Darussalam (2035), Cabo Verde (2030), Czechia (2025), China (2030), Congo (2030), Egypt (2030), Greece (2029), Guatemala (2022), Guinea (2025), Kyrgyzstan (2024), Lao People's Democratic Republic (2025), Lebanon (2030), Madagascar (2025), Malawi (2025), Malaysia (2025), Maldives (2025), Mongolia (2025), Mozambique (2035), Namibia (2022), Philippines (2028), Qatar (2025), South Africa (2025), Uganda (2025), United Arab Emirates (2021), and Zambia (2025).

18. The actual implications of adoption as a policy instrument will vary from country to country and by level of adoption, and it is still too early to assess if, and to what extent, adoption as a policy instrument has indeed resulted in mainstreaming of biodiversity into sectoral and cross-sectoral policy and practice. In the meantime, the Secretariat observes that Parties have responded to this component of Aichi Biodiversity Target 17 by having their NBSAPs adopted by a variety of authorities, including royalty, cabinet and councils of ministers. Other Parties have kept this adoption strictly in the realm of the environmental sector. Still others have made their NBSAP guiding frameworks without necessarily imparting legal power to this role. Some examples follow.

19. A total of 34 NBSAPs¹² have been adopted as “whole-of-government” instruments. For example:

(a) The NBSAPs of India, Georgia, Germany, Guyana, Hungary, Japan, Myanmar, Nepal, Seychelles and Tuvalu were adopted/endorsed by their Cabinets;

(b) The Councils of Ministers of Belarus, Benin, Greece, Mauritania, Poland and Sudan approved their NBSAP;

(c) The NBSAP of the European Union was adopted by the Commission and was endorsed by the Council of Ministers and the European Parliament;

(d) The NBSAP of France was adopted by the Prime Minister and has been mainstreamed into the road maps of other ministries;

(e) The NBSAPs of Norway and Sweden were adopted by the Council of State and the Parliament, respectively.

20. Another four NBSAPs¹³ have been adopted as instruments applying to the environmental sector. For example: the Biodiversity Conservation Strategy of Australia was adopted by the Government and functions as a policy “umbrella” over other more specific national environmental 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;

21. Another six NBSAPs¹⁴ serve as guidance or framework documents:

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

(b) The NBSAP of El Salvador provides a framework and specific guidance on actions related to environment, more specifically on biodiversity;

(c) The NBSAP of the Republic of Korea is considered a comprehensive framework for achieving the nation’s goals to conserve its biodiversity for the coming five years;

22. A total of 11 other countries¹⁵ have stated their intent to have their NBSAP adopted as a policy instrument. The remaining 56 NBSAPs 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

1. Assessment of previous NBSAP

23. Of the Parties that have submitted a post-2010 NBSAP, 70¹⁶ mention having done an assessment¹⁷ of their previous NBSAP as part of, or contributing to the revision process. These assessments have

¹² Armenia, Belarus, Benin, Colombia, Denmark, Estonia, European Union, Finland, France, Georgia, Germany, Greece, Guyana, Hungary, India, Japan, Kyrgyzstan, Madagascar, Malta, Mongolia, Myanmar, Nepal, Netherlands, Norway, Poland, Peru, Republic of Moldova, Serbia, Seychelles, Spain, Sudan, Sweden, Switzerland and Tuvalu.

¹³ Australia, Bhutan, Dominican Republic and Guatemala.

¹⁴ Belgium, El Salvador, Germany, Mali, Republic of Korea and Timor-Leste.

¹⁵ Afghanistan, Antigua and Barbuda, Burundi, Guinea, Jordan, Lebanon, Mauritania, Philippines, Samoa, Uganda and Zimbabwe.

¹⁶ Albania, Antigua and Barbuda, Armenia, Australia, Bahrain, Belgium, Benin, Bhutan, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Burundi, Cabo Verde, Cambodia, Cameroon, Chad, Czechia, China, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Dominica, Democratic People’s

helped Parties to understand the strengths and shortcomings of their previous NBSAPs in order to build and improve on these in the latest revision. The specific subjects covered in these assessments vary. Generally, they have addressed the proportion of NBSAP activities that have been implemented, their achievements, and implementation challenges. Some examples follow:

(a) The assessments of 10 Parties¹⁸ reported the percentage of accomplishment of the previous NBSAP's objectives, projects or activities. The percentages ranged from 16 to 96 per cent (reported by Malaysia). The average was 50 per cent;

(b) The assessments of 27 Parties¹⁹ reported on achievements during the period of their previous NBSAP. Of these, the most commonly cited were increases in protected area coverage (12 Parties) or improvements in their management (7 Parties), the establishment of new conservation programs (12 Parties), and the development of new policies, legislation, and/or the improvement of institutional frameworks (12 Parties);

(c) The assessments of 33 Parties²⁰ reported on implementation challenges. The most commonly cited were insufficient financial resources (18 Parties), inadequate monitoring and evaluation frameworks (16 Parties), and lack of/weak mainstreaming in national and sectoral policies (10 Parties).

2. *Stakeholder engagement*

24. Most Parties reported the involvement of a range of stakeholders in the NBSAP revision process. However, few insights are provided on the quality of this involvement or the implications for the implementation of the NBSAP. The government ministries that were most commonly involved were: Agriculture, Development/Planning, Fisheries, Forestry, Tourism, Education, and Finance. Other ministries involved included: Trade and Industry, Infrastructure/Transport, Science and Technology, Culture, Economy, Sports, Health, and Social Affairs (see table 1).

25. Parties also reported the involvement of non-governmental stakeholders in the revision process. These include indigenous and local communities (reported in 22 NBSAPs²¹), NGOs/civil society (59 NBSAPs²²), private sector (30 NBSAPs²³) and academia (43 NBSAPs²⁴).

Republic of Korea, Egypt, Equatorial Ethiopia, European Union, Finland, Gambia, Germany, Grenada, Guinea, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, European Union, France, Georgia, India, Ireland, Japan, Jordan, Lebanon, Madagascar, Malawi, Mauritania, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Namibia, Nepal, Nigeria, Niue, Philippines, Poland, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Russian Federation, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Samoa, Senegal, Seychelles, Slovakia, South Africa, Suriname, Togo, Viet Nam, Uganda, United Kingdom, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Zambia and Zimbabwe.

¹⁷ This includes assessments of implementation of relevance to the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020, among others.

¹⁸ Dominica, Jordan, Mongolia, Namibia, Poland, Republic of Korea, Saint Kitts and Nevis, South Africa, United Republic of Tanzania and Viet Nam.

¹⁹ Albania, Armenia, Australia, Bahrain, Bhutan, Cabo Verde, Chad, China, Comoros, Egypt, Gambia, Georgia, Grenada, Guinea, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Madagascar, Malawi, Namibia, Republic of Korea, Samoa, Senegal, Seychelles, South Africa, Uganda, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, and Uruguay.

²⁰ Armenia, Australia, Bahrain, Botswana, Cambodia, Cameroon, Czechia, China, Comoros, Egypt, Equatorial Guinea, Ethiopia, France, Gambia, Grenada, Guinea, Jordan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Maldives, Mozambique, Namibia, Nigeria, Philippines, Poland, Russian Federation, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Samoa, Senegal, Uganda, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

²¹ Burundi, Cameroon, Colombia, Ethiopia, Finland, Gambia, Grenada, Guatemala, Guyana, Ireland, Japan, Malawi, Namibia, Peru, Philippines, Senegal, South Africa, Suriname, Togo, Uganda, Venezuela and Zambia.

²² Afghanistan, Antigua and Barbuda, Bahrain, Belarus, Belgium, Bhutan, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Burundi, Cabo Verde, Cameroon, Colombia, Congo, Côte d'Ivoire, Dominica, Dominican Republic, Equatorial Guinea, Eritrea, Estonia, Ethiopia, Finland, France, Gambia, Georgia, Greece, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, Hungary, Iraq, Japan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Liechtenstein, Malawi, Maldives, Mongolia, Myanmar, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nigeria, Peru, Philippines, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Samoa, Senegal, Serbia, Seychelles, South Africa, Spain, Sudan, Timor-Leste, Togo, Uganda, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Zambia and Zimbabwe.

²³ Bahrain, Cabo Verde, Cameroon, Colombia, Congo, Dominica, Dominican Republic, Estonia, Finland, France, Gambia, Georgia, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, Iraq, Japan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Malawi, Maldives, Mozambique, Namibia, Peru, Philippines, Spain, Sudan, Switzerland, Togo, Uganda, United Republic of Tanzania and Uruguay.

²⁴ Afghanistan, Bahrain, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Cabo Verde, Cambodia, Colombia, Côte d'Ivoire, Dominican Republic, Equatorial Guinea, Eritrea, Estonia, Ethiopia, Finland, France, Gambia, Georgia, Guatemala, Iraq, Japan, Jordan, Lao People's

26. Of the 110 NBSAPs reviewed, 66 record having a formal coordination structure, or a working group for NBSAP-related tasks, composed of different stakeholders.²⁵ The mandates of these coordination mechanisms vary. While in some countries their mandate is limited to the revision of the NBSAP, in other countries, coordination mechanisms are also mandated to monitor implementation. In some, they are also mandated to oversee the implementation process itself (European Union, Ireland, Japan, Nigeria, Senegal South Africa and Timor-Leste).

Table 1. Number of Parties reporting the involvement and roles of other ministries in NBSAP process

Involvement	Agriculture	Dev. Planning	Fisheries	Forestry	Tourism	Education	Finance	Trade & Industry	Infrast/Transport	Science & Tech	Culture	Economy	Sports	Health	Social affairs
On committee	29	19	18	16	14	13	12	11	10	8	8	8	5	4	5
Consulted	20	8	8	14	11	12	14	7	4	8	8	4	2	6	1
Will implement	4	3	2	4	2	0	1	4	2	2	0	0	1	2	2

3. *Clearing-house mechanism*

27. Of the 110 Parties that have submitted a revised NBSAP to date, the Secretariat is aware of a total of 69²⁶ that have a national clearing-house mechanism or similar infrastructure. However, only five Parties reported having used their national clearing-house mechanism in the NBSAP revision process.²⁷ Twenty²⁸ Parties have set actions and/or plans in their revised NBSAP to establish a national clearing-house mechanism.

28. Of those Parties that do have a clearing-house mechanism, 36²⁹ mention their intention to improve and enhance their current information management system.

Democratic Republic, Kyrgyzstan, Lebanon, Malawi, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nigeria, Philippines, Samoa, Senegal, Serbia, Seychelles, Spain, Timor-Leste, Togo, Uganda, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Zambia, and Zimbabwe.

²⁵ Afghanistan, Antigua and Barbuda, Australia, Austria, Bahrain, Belarus, Belgium, Bhutan, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Burkina Faso (according to IUCN study), Cabo Verde, Cambodia, Cameroon, Chad, Czechia, Colombia (according to IUCN study), Congo, Dominican Republic, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Egypt, Eritrea, Estonia, Ethiopia, European Union, France, Finland, Gambia, Georgia, Greece, Guatemala (according to IUCN study), Guinea, Guyana (only plans for implementation), India, Iraq, Ireland, Japan, Jordan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Madagascar, Maldives, Mali, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Netherlands, Nepal, Nigeria, Niue, Peru, Philippines, Samoa, Senegal, Serbia, Seychelles, South Africa, Sudan, Timor-Leste, Togo, Uganda, United Republic of Tanzania, Viet Nam, Zambia and Zimbabwe.

²⁶ Albania, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Bahrain, Belarus, Belgium, Benin, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cambodia, Cameroon, Chad, Canada, Czechia, China, Colombia, Congo, Côte d'Ivoire, Denmark, Dominican Republic, El Salvador, Estonia, Ethiopia, European Union, Finland, France, Georgia, Germany, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Hungary, India, Italy, Japan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Morocco, Netherlands, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Philippines, Poland, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Russian Federation, Samoa, Senegal, Serbia, Seychelles, Slovakia, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, Togo, Uganda, United Kingdom, Uruguay, Venezuela and Zambia.

²⁷ Belgium, European Union, France, Japan and Niger.

²⁸ Antigua and Barbuda, Dominica, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Equatorial Guinea, Gambia, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Iraq, Jordan, Malawi, Mongolia, Myanmar, Nepal, Niue, Peru, South Africa, Sudan, Timor-Leste, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania.

²⁹ Albania, Australia, Belgium, Burundi, Cambodia, Cameroon, Chad, China, Colombia, Egypt, Ethiopia, European Union, Finland, Georgia, Germany, Guatemala, Italy, Japan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Morocco, Mozambique, Norway, Philippines, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Samoa, Togo, United Kingdom, Venezuela.

C. Components

1. *Resource mobilization strategies*

29. In decision XI/14 paragraph 25, the Conference of the Parties encouraged Parties 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, 18 NBSAPs³⁰ specifically contain a national resource mobilization strategy or equivalent.³¹ Some examples are:

(a) Bosnia and Herzegovina prepared a Resource Mobilization Plan, which includes: (i) the state in the domain of financing of protection of biodiversity; (ii) revenues and beneficiaries of the funds for environmental protection; (iii) potential international sources of funding for conservation and biodiversity; (iv) assessment of efficiency of the existing model for financing of biodiversity; (v) mobilization of resources for financing of biodiversity; (vi) monitoring of the implementation;

(b) Some of the activities planned in the Resource Mobilization Plan of Botswana include: (i) ensuring that the National Environment Fund is fully functional and includes a specific allocation for biodiversity conservation activities; and (ii) commissioning a study on disaggregated biodiversity-related expenditure and revenue for the public sector, private sector, NGOs, CBOs, ICPs and research institutions;

(c) The NBSAP of the Maldives includes a Resource Mobilization Strategy which outlines the financial needs and describes several options for raising funds, such as: tourism revenues, fishing and forestry industry revenues, real estate and development rights, the Maldives Green Fund (recognized as a potential highly important source of funds), Green tax, rectifying perverse incentives, private sector.

30. A total of 40 revised NBSAPs include a costing for their action plans. Only 9 of these (already mentioned above) also contain a completed resource mobilization strategy.³²

31. A total of 61³³ Parties have set national targets in line with Aichi Biodiversity Target 20, and 66 explain, in their NBSAPs, efforts that have been put in place to increase financing for biodiversity in their countries and/or their intention to develop resource mobilization plans:

(a) In Guinea-Bissau, the creation of the BioGuiné Foundation in 2011 has enabled implementation of activities related to sustainable protected areas management and the development of sustainable financing mechanisms for protected areas;

(b) In the last decade, Malaysia has seen some diversification of conservation funding. Various trust funds (e.g. Marine Parks Trust Fund, Taman Negara Trust Fund), and recently the National Conservation Trust Fund for Natural Resources, have been set up as long-term sustainable financing mechanisms;

(c) Mozambique has a Foundation for the Conservation of Biodiversity, which is a private institution whose mission is to support the conservation and sustainable management of natural resources and aquatic and terrestrial biodiversity.

³⁰ Belgium, Benin, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Burundi, Comoros, Côte d'Ivoire, Guinea, Guyana, Malawi, Maldives, Mali, Mauritania, Morocco, Niger, Nigeria, Niue and Timor-Leste.

³¹ Some Parties may have submitted resource mobilization strategies or components thereof, not in their NBSAP, but in their financial reports to the Convention and/or in their fifth national reports or other documents. These are not considered in the present document.

³² Albania, Bahrain, Benin, Bhutan, Botswana, Brunei Darussalam, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Chad, Dominica, Egypt, Eritrea, Estonia, Finland, Guatemala, Guinea-Bissau, Guinea, India, Kyrgyzstan, Lebanon, Madagascar, Malawi, Maldives, Mali, Mauritania, Mozambique, Namibia, Nepal, Nicaragua, Niger, Republic of Moldova, Philippines, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Senegal, Sudan, Suriname, Spain, Togo, Uganda and Zimbabwe.

³³ Afghanistan, Albania, Antigua and Barbuda, Cabo Verde, Belarus, Belgium, Benin, Bhutan, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Burundi, Cambodia, Cameroon, China, Comoros, Congo, Dominican Republic, Equatorial Guinea, Egypt, Eritrea, Ethiopia, European Union, Finland, Gambia, Georgia, Germany, Greece, Guinea-Bissau, Guinea, Guyana, Hungary, India, Iraq, Jordan, Japan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mauritania, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nigeria, Niue, Republic of Korea, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Serbia, Samoa, Serbia, Uganda, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Zambia and Zimbabwe.

2. *Communication, education and public awareness*

32. Decisions VIII/6 and IX/8 state that communication, education and public awareness (CEPA) strategies and activities should be integral parts of NBSAPs. Of the 110 post-Nagoya NBSAPs, 23³⁴ contain a CEPA strategy and action plan or equivalent and another 71³⁵ contain initiatives relating to communication, education and public awareness. Some examples follow:

(a) In Finland, continuing education for teachers (in species knowledge and pedagogy in biodiversity issues) will be developed, and, with the help of new information technology, species knowledge and sustainable development education will be promoted;

(b) Nicaragua is intending to integrate the themes of Mother Earth and Biodiversity into university curricula. The country will also introduce the best thesis based on the Route to the Common Good (Ruta del Bien Común de la Madre Tierra), in youth forums, to promote research on biodiversity;

(c) Norway will continue its Sustainable Backpack programme, a nationwide initiative by the Ministry of Education and Research and the Ministry of Climate and Environment to support Norwegian schools in implementing Education for Sustainable Development;

(d) Saint Kitts and Nevis is planning to establish a biodiversity knowledge network within secondary schools using EduNET, which is a network for facilitating communication, collaboration, e-Learning and research for secondary school students;

(e) In December 2010, the Government of Sweden adopted the outdoor recreation policy's overarching goals, established to support opportunities for people to spend time in nature and enjoy outdoor recreational activities.

33. A total of 85 Parties³⁶ have set national targets and/or objectives in relation to Aichi Biodiversity Target 1.

3. *Capacity development*

34. A total of 14 NBSAPs – those of Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Burundi, Comoros, Guyana, Lebanon, Malawi, Maldives, Mali, Morocco, Nigeria, Niue, Suriname and Timor-Leste – include a national capacity development plan; some examples of these plans are presented below. In addition, 54 other countries³⁷ list several capacity-building activities, some of which also indicate the budget allocated as well as the entity in charge of the activity:

³⁴ Benin, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Burundi, Comoros, Côte d'Ivoire, Finland, France, Guatemala, Guyana, Lebanon, Malawi, Maldives, Mauritania, Namibia, Nepal, Niger, Nigeria, Niue, Philippines, Senegal, Sudan and Timor-Leste.

³⁵ Albania, Antigua and Barbuda, Armenia, Austria, Bahrain, Belarus, Belgium, Bhutan, Brunei Darussalam, Cabo Verde, Cambodia, Canada, Chad, Czechia, China, Congo, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Egypt, Equatorial Guinea, Eritrea, Estonia, Ethiopia, European Union, Finland, Gambia, Georgia, Germany, Greece, Grenada, Guinea-Bissau, Guinea, Hungary, India, Iraq, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Jordan, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Madagascar, Malaysia, Mali, Malta, Mozambique, Nicaragua, Norway, Peru, Poland, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Russian Federation, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Samoa, Serbia, Slovakia, South Africa, Spain, Sweden, Togo, Uganda, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, and Zambia and Zimbabwe.

³⁶ Albania, Antigua and Barbuda, Armenia, Austria, Bahrain, Belarus, Belgium, Benin, Bhutan, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Burundi, Cabo Verde, Cambodia, Canada, Czechia, China, Comoros, Congo, Côte d'Ivoire, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Egypt, Equatorial Guinea, Eritrea, Estonia, Ethiopia, Gambia, Georgia, Germany, Greece, Grenada, Guinea-Bissau, Guinea, Guyana, Japan, India, Hungary, Iraq, Ireland, Italy, Jordan, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nicaragua, Nigeria, Niue, Peru, Philippines, Republic of Korea, Qatar, Republic of Moldova, Russian Federation, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Samoa, Senegal, Serbia, Slovakia, South Africa, Spain, Sudan, Sweden, Togo, Timor-Leste, Uganda, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Venezuela, Zambia and Zimbabwe.

³⁷ Armenia, Austria, Burkina Faso, Bahrain, Cabo Verde, Cambodia, Cameroon, Chad, Czechia, China, Congo, Dominica, Egypt, Eritrea, Georgia, Greece, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea-Bissau, Guinea, Hungary, India, Iraq, Japan, Jordan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Liechtenstein, Madagascar, Malaysia, Mauritania, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nicaragua, Niger, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Nepal, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Senegal, Serbia, Seychelles, Slovakia, South Africa, Sudan, Togo, Tuvalu, Uganda, Uruguay, United Kingdom, Zambia and Zimbabwe.

(a) Nigeria developed a plan for capacity development and technical capacity needs assessment. For each of the core capacity issues, the plan lists individual and institutional capacity needs and specific actions. In addition, the plan includes a section on technology needs, identified technologies and required actions;

(b) The Capacity Development Plan of Suriname has four sub-objectives: (i) generic capacity developed; (ii) relevant ministries and associated institutes strengthened; (iii) socially responsible entrepreneurship by companies, with due observance of green/sustainability principles; (iv) local civil society organizations and communities capable of fulfilling their role in relation to biodiversity;

35. The NBSAPs of 21 Parties³⁸ referred to the National Capacity Self-Assessment and/or other training/capacity needs assessments.³⁹

D. Mainstreaming

1. *Valuation of biodiversity and ecosystem services*

36. A total of 30 Parties⁴⁰ report having conducted valuation studies of the biodiversity in their country, or parts thereof. There is not enough information, however, to determine if the results of these exercises have been significantly considered in setting priorities, mainstreaming and/or developing the revised NBSAP. Some examples of valuation studies conducted include:

(a) Cabo Verde has done valuation studies for ecotourism, forests, and for the export of products;

(b) Egypt — Wadi El Ryan and Ras Mohamed protected areas;

(c) Lao People's Democratic Republic — Lung area wetlands;

(d) The Russian Federation performed an evaluation of the economic value of the wetland area in the Dubna region ("Craneland"), which demonstrated the benefit of the ecosystem from the direct use of bioresources;

(e) Saint Kitts and Nevis has conducted a comprehensive land valuation exercise. The country is also planning to do more studies on the intrinsic socioeconomic and cultural value of biodiversity;

(f) Zimbabwe conducted a valuation study on protected areas as part of its NBSAP revision process.

37. Of the 110 NBSAPs reviewed, 31 countries⁴¹ have set national targets on valuation and another 34 state the intention of conducting valuation studies in the future.⁴² For example:

(a) Armenia, Mozambique and the United Republic of Tanzania have set actions to develop tools, methods or methodologies for the valuation of biodiversity and ecosystem services;

(b) Morocco has programmes that are currently being elaborated to value the camel breeding sector which constitutes a major source of prestige and income for the people of southern Morocco.

³⁸ Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Cambodia, Cameroon, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Dominican Republic, Eritrea, Guyana, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Mongolia, Niue, Samoa, Suriname, Timor-Leste, Tuvalu.

³⁹ Afghanistan, Congo, Nepal, Peru, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Seychelles.

⁴⁰ Botswana, Bhutan, Cabo Verde, Colombia, Denmark, Egypt, El Salvador, Ethiopia, European Union, Georgia, Germany, Grenada, Guyana, Japan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Maldives, Malta, Mongolia, Myanmar, Netherlands, Norway, Republic of Moldova, Russian Federation, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Seychelles, Sweden, Uganda, Uruguay, Viet Nam and Zimbabwe.

⁴¹ Armenia, Antigua and Barbuda, Belarus, Belgium, Bhutan, Burundi, Cameroon, Congo, Dominican Republic, Equatorial Guinea, Estonia, Gambia, Georgia, Greece, Guatemala, India, Japan, Jordan, Mali, Malawi, Mauritania, Mozambique, Namibia, Nigeria, Peru, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Senegal, Switzerland, Uganda, United Republic of Tanzania and Uruguay.

⁴² Antigua and Barbuda, Armenia, Belarus, Belgium, Burundi, Cambodia, Cameroon, Dominica, Dominican Republic, Equatorial Guinea, Estonia, Finland, France, Gambia, Guatemala, India, Japan, Jordan, Ireland, Italy, Malta, Namibia, Nepal, Niger, Nigeria, Peru, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Slovakia, Suriname, Timor-Leste, Togo, Tuvalu, and Zambia.

2. *National development plans*

38. A total of 22 Parties⁴³ state that biodiversity has been integrated into their national development plan or equivalent instrument:

(a) Biodiversity figures prominently in the eleventh Five Year Plan of Bhutan (2013-2018);

(b) The government coalition programme of Estonia 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; the NBSAP of Malawi was prepared in response to the Malawi Growth and Development Strategy II (MGDS II 2011-2016), which prioritizes biodiversity management programs among other socio-economic and environmental issues;

(c) The “Plan de développement économique et social”(PDES) of Niger takes biodiversity into consideration in two of its axes: one on balanced and sustainable development and another on sustainable food security and agricultural development;

(d) The “Plan Bicentenario” of Peru “El Perú hacia el 2021” recognizes and positions biodiversity conservation as a national objective;

(e) The National Strategic Development Plan (SDP) of Timor-Leste commits to meeting several of the Aichi Biodiversity Targets;

39. The NBSAPs of 19 other Parties⁴⁴ contain elements and/or targets and actions which aim at mainstreaming with the national development plan or equivalent instrument.

3. *Sustainable development plans*

40. Of the 110 NBSAPs reviewed, 17 Parties⁴⁵ mention an integration of their NBSAP with their sustainable development plans or equivalent instruments. For example:

(a) The Second Federal Plan for Sustainable Development of Belgium 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) The National Biodiversity Strategy of France is a major component of the National Sustainable Development Strategy (SNDD);

(d) The NBSAP of Niger is part of one of six programmes comprising the National Plan for the Environment for Sustainable Development.

4. *Poverty eradication*

41. A total of 39 Parties’ post-Nagoya NBSAPs⁴⁶ mention links to poverty eradication and/or integrate this objective into their principles, targets and/or actions. For example:

(a) Antigua and Barbuda, India and Togo, among others, include poverty eradication strategies in their national equivalent of Aichi Biodiversity Target 2;

⁴³ Burkina Faso, Burundi, Bhutan, Dominican Republic, Equatorial Guinea, Estonia, Iraq, Malawi, Namibia, Netherlands, Niger, Niue, Peru, Philippines, Slovakia, South Africa, Timor-Leste, Uganda, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, Venezuela, Viet Nam and United Republic of Tanzania.

⁴⁴ Armenia, Bahrain, Belgium, Botswana, Cabo Verde, Cameroon, Colombia, Comoros, Egypt, Finland, France, Ireland, Malawi, Nigeria, Qatar, South Africa, United Kingdom, Zambia and Zimbabwe.

⁴⁵ Belgium, Czechia, Estonia, European Union, Finland, France, Ireland, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Mauritania, Myanmar, Niger, Serbia, Seychelles, South Africa, Switzerland and Timor-Leste.

⁴⁶ Afghanistan, Antigua and Barbuda, Belgium, Benin, Bhutan, Botswana, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cabo Verde, Cambodia, China, Congo, Comoros, Cote d'Ivoire, Equatorial Guinea, Finland, Gambia, Georgia, Guinea, Guyana, India, Italy, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Madagascar, Mali, Morocco, Namibia, Nicaragua, Nigeria, Niger, Peru, Philippines, Republic of Moldova, Saint Kitts and Nevis, South Africa, Sudan, Togo, Uganda and United Republic of Tanzania.

(b) The poverty reduction strategies or equivalents of Burkina Faso, Burundi, Congo, Gambia, Niger, Equatorial Guinea and the United Republic of Tanzania integrate biodiversity considerations;

(c) The NBSAPs of Afghanistan, Moldova, Namibia, Niger and Peru aim to implement biodiversity actions in order to contribute to poverty alleviation. The NBSAP of Namibia, through its CBNRM Programme, monitors the role biodiversity plays in poverty alleviation in rural areas;

(d) As part of the implementation of its Development Policy, Finland seeks to support development cooperation projects aimed at reducing poverty in developing countries, through the conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity, and with the objective of safeguarding and strengthening ecosystem services;

(e) The NBSAP of Uganda highlights and seeks to maintain the contribution of biodiversity and ecosystem services to human well-being, poverty eradication and national development as one of its guiding principles.

5. *Subnational level plans*

42. The post-Nagoya NBSAPs of six Parties⁴⁷ mention that their country either already has subnational biodiversity plans or has started developing them (examples appear below). The Secretariat is aware of 19 Parties (including the 6 mentioned above) that have at least one subnational biodiversity action plan⁴⁸ however, not all of these are reflected in the revised NBSAPs. Information on these can be found at: <https://www.cbd.int/nbsap/related-info/sbsap/default.shtml>. A total of 10 other Parties⁴⁹ mention their intent to prepare subnational biodiversity strategies and actions plans.

(a) In Bosnia and Herzegovina, local environmental plans which integrate the values of biological diversity (as a separate domain in the action plan) have been developed in 5 out of 10 cantons;

(b) In Malawi, the Lilongwe City Council is developing a Local Biodiversity Strategy and Action Plan (LBSAP) that highlights particular species and habitats to be protected in the city and how biodiversity and development can go together with the city's development activities. Malawi also has a national target to develop LBSAPs;

43. Several national and/or subnational authorities have developed guidance for subnational authorities in preparing and/or implementing biodiversity plans.

44. A total of 19 other NBSAPs⁵⁰ contain elements, actions or targets 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 territorial plans/documents;

(b) Burundi – Target 18, action 2, – “Elaborate ecoregional (local) plans for the implementation of the National Biodiversity Strategy and Action Plan”. This action also proposed that these local implementation plans would be integrated into the community development plans;

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

⁴⁷ Austria, Japan, Peru, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Republic of Korea, and United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland.

⁴⁸ <https://www.cbd.int/nbsap/related-info/sbsap/default.shtml>

⁴⁹ Bosnia and Herzegovina, China, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Ireland, Malawi, Myanmar, Nepal, Nigeria, Russian Federation, and United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland.

⁵⁰ Australia, Belgium, Burundi, Cambodia, Cameroon, Canada, France, India, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Malta, Malawi, Malaysia, Nigeria, Norway, Sudan, Russian Federation, United Kingdom of Great Britain, Republic of Korea and Zimbabwe.

(d) The strategy of France 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;

(e) Malta intends to engage local councils in the implementation of the NBSAP at the local/subnational level and will integrate biodiversity considerations into urban infrastructure investments;

(f) The Republic of Korea has developed guidelines for planning local biodiversity strategies and is establishing a legal basis for metropolitan cities/provinces to set up biodiversity strategies in the Act on the Conservation and the Use of Biodiversity. The Republic of Korea aims to have eight metropolitan or provincial strategies by 2018.

6. *Gender*⁵¹

45. A total of 45 Parties⁵² make reference to gender issues and/or to the involvement of women in actions related to biodiversity conservation. Among these are the following:

(a) The NBSAPs of Burkina Faso, Cameroon, Ethiopia, Georgia, Guyana, the Lao People's Democratic Republic, Nepal, Nigeria and Timor-Leste contain targets or actions on gender mainstreaming and/or the enhanced involvement of women; several of these targets are national equivalents of Aichi Biodiversity Target 14 aiming to safeguard essential ecosystem services for women (among other vulnerable groups);

(b) In Uganda, provisions for biodiversity management have been mainstreamed into the National Gender Policy, and the NBSAP contains an activity to promote accountability, transparency and gender mainstreaming in the implementation of biodiversity projects. Uganda's proposed activities include the development of gender-responsive guidelines for implementing the NBSAP;

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

(d) Tuvalu, Bahrain, Iraq, the Lao People's Democratic Republic, among others, include women's organizations as stakeholders in their biodiversity planning activities;

(e) Burundi's CEPA Strategy identifies rural women as a specific target group for whom particular communication approaches will be adopted. Over the last decade, CEPA activities have been carried out for the purpose of raising awareness among women's groups on issues related to forestry, agroforestry and biodiversity conservation.

⁵¹ A summary of a separate and more extensive analysis of gender in all NBSAPs submitted (from 1993 to May 2016) is included in UNEP/CBD/COP/13/8/Add.3.

⁵² Bahrain, Bhutan, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cabo Verde, Cameroon, Chad, Congo, Comoros, Dominican Republic, Equatorial Guinea, Egypt, Eritrea, Ethiopia, Gambia, Georgia, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, India, Iraq, Japan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Madagascar, Mali, Mauritania, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Niger, Peru, Philippines, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Senegal, Sudan, Timor-Leste, Togo, Tuvalu, Uganda, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Zimbabwe.