



Convention on Biological Diversity

Distr.: General
18 October 2024

Original: English

Subsidiary Body on Implementation

Fifth meeting

Cali, Colombia, 16–18 October 2024

Agenda item 4

Adoption of the report

Report of the Subsidiary Body on Implementation on its fifth meeting

Summary

The Subsidiary Body on Implementation held its fifth meeting in Cali, Colombia, from 16 to 18 October 2024. It considered all items on its agenda and adopted a recommendation on review of implementation: progress in national target setting and updating of national biodiversity strategies and action plans, and a recommendation on the pilot open-ended forum for voluntary country review of implementation held at the present meeting.

The draft decisions contained in the recommendations will be submitted to the Conference of the Parties to the Convention on Biological Diversity for consideration at its sixteenth meeting.

The account of proceedings of the meeting appears in section II of the report.

The Chair's summary of the discussions held during the pilot open-ended forum is annexed to the report.

* Reissued for technical reasons on 24 October 2024.

Contents

I.	Recommendations adopted by the Subsidiary Body on Implementation.....	3
5/1.	Review of implementation: progress in national target setting and updating of national biodiversity strategies and action plans	3
5/2.	Pilot open-ended forum for voluntary country review of implementation at the fifth meeting of the Subsidiary Body on Implementation	8
II.	Account of proceedings.....	9
Annex.	Chair's summary of the discussions held during the pilot open-ended forum for voluntary country review of implementation at the fifth meeting of the Subsidiary Body on Implementation	17

I. Recommendations adopted by the Subsidiary Body on Implementation on 18 October 2024

5/1. Review of implementation: progress in national target setting and updating of national biodiversity strategies and action plans

The Subsidiary Body on Implementation,

Recalling decisions XIII/25 of 9 December 2016, 14/28 of 25 November 2018 and 15/6 of 19 December 2022 of the Conference of the Parties to the Convention on Biological Diversity,¹

Having considered the information provided in document CBD/SBI/5/2/Rev.1 and its addenda,²

Recommends that, at its sixteenth meeting, the Conference of the Parties adopt a decision along the following lines:

The Conference of the Parties,

Recalling the adoption of mechanisms for planning, monitoring, reporting and review in decision 15/6 of 19 December 2022,

Noting the outcomes of and the information and experiences shared during the regional and subregional dialogues on national biodiversity strategies and action plans, and expressing its appreciation to the Parties that hosted the dialogues and the Parties and organizations that provided financial and logistical support for them,

Noting with appreciation the support provided to many Parties by the Global Environment Facility and its implementing agencies for facilitating the revision or updating of national biodiversity strategies and action plans, while noting with concern that not all eligible Parties were provided with support or timely support,

Recognizing that the revision or updating of national biodiversity strategies and action plans in line with the Kunming-Montreal Global Biodiversity Framework³ depends on the provision of adequate, sufficient, predictable and accessible means of implementation, including financial resources, capacity-building and capacity development, technical and scientific cooperation and technology transfer, in particular for developing country Parties,

1. *Congratulates* the Parties that have submitted their revised and updated national biodiversity strategies and action plans in the light of the Kunming-Montreal Global Biodiversity Framework, as listed in annex I;

2. *Notes with satisfaction* that a number of Parties, as listed in annex II, have communicated national targets aligned with the global targets of the Framework, either as a stand-alone submission or as part of the submission of their national biodiversity strategies and action plans, and submitted those following the template provided in annex I to decision 15/6 and using the online reporting tool of the clearing-house mechanism;

3. *Urges* Parties that have not yet done so to revise or update their national biodiversity strategies and action plans, as requested in decision 15/6, as soon as possible;

4. *Encourages* Parties to enable the full and effective participation and engagement of women, indigenous peoples and local communities, youth, civil society organizations, academia, the private sector, all levels of government and stakeholders from all other relevant

¹ United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 1760, No. 30619.

² CBD/SBI/5/2/Add.1/Rev.1, CBD/SBI/5/2/Add.2/Rev.1 and CBD/SBI/5/2/Add.3.

³ Decision 15/4, annex.

sectors in all levels of the revision or updating of the national biodiversity strategies and action plans through inclusive and transparent modalities;

5. *Requests* the Global Environment Facility and its implementing agencies to provide timely support to all eligible Parties, aligned with national circumstances and needs, upon request, to enable them to revise or update their national biodiversity strategies and action plans;

[6. *Urges* all Parties to implement their national biodiversity strategies and action plans, recognizing the need for enhanced support to developing countries through adequate, predictable and easily accessible means of implementation and taking the considerations for the implementation of the Framework into account.]

[6alt. *Urges* all Parties to implement their national biodiversity strategies and action plans[, in accordance with Article 20 of the Convention,][according to national circumstances, priorities and capabilities,] recognizing the need for enhanced support, [in particular for] [to] developing countries, [in particular the least developed countries and small island developing States[, as well as countries with economies in transition,]] through adequate, [speedy,] predictable and easily accessible means of implementation [from all sources on a needs basis] and taking the considerations for the implementation[, as set out in section C] of the Framework[,] into account.]

Annex I

List of Parties having submitted a national biodiversity strategy and action plan to the Secretariat aligned with the Kunming-Montreal Global Biodiversity Framework since December 2022, as at 18 October 2024⁴

	<i>Party</i>	<i>Date of receipt by the Secretariat</i>
1	Afghanistan	28 July 2024
2	Australia	27 September 2024
3	Austria ^a	3 May 2024
4	Burkina Faso	15 August 2024
5	Canada	21 June 2024
6	China	25 January 2024
7	Cuba	31 July 2024
8	European Union	14 November 2023
9	France	11 December 2023
10	Hungary	28 August 2023
11	Indonesia	12 September 2024
12	Ireland	8 February 2024
13	Italy ^b	9 July 2024
14	Japan	11 July 2023
15	Jordan	11 August 2024
16	Libya	17 October 2024
17	Luxembourg	7 November 2023
18	Malaysia	31 July 2024

⁴ The list will be updated during the sixteenth meeting of the Conference of the Parties to take any additional submissions received into account.

19	Malta	23 September 2024
20	Mexico	22 August 2024
21	Norway	7 October 2024
22	Republic of Korea	2 August 2024
23	Republic of Moldova	16 October 2024
24	Slovenia	10 September 2024
25	Spain	30 January 2023
26	State of Palestine	16 October 2024
27	Suriname	16 July 2024
28	Tonga	27 September 2024
29	Tunisia	15 October 2024
30	Uganda	15 October 2024
31	United Arab Emirates	9 October 2024

^a Not submitted in an official United Nations language.

^b Only the summary was submitted in an official United Nations language.

Annex II

List of Parties having submitted national targets aligned with the Kunming-Montreal Global Biodiversity Framework through the online reporting tool, as at 18 October 2024⁵

	<i>Party</i>	<i>Date of publication</i>
1	Algeria	1 August 2024
2	Angola	13 September 2024
3	Australia	18 October 2024
4	Austria	1 August 2024
5	Azerbaijan	20 July 2024
6	Bangladesh	29 September 2024
7	Benin	30 September 2024
8	Bhutan	25 July 2024
9	Bosnia and Herzegovina	2 August 2024
10	Botswana	14 October 2024
11	Burkina Faso	16 August 2024
12	Burundi	25 July 2024
13	Cabo Verde	18 October 2024
14	Cambodia	29 July 2024
15	Cameroon	23 August 2024
16	Canada	20 September 2024
17	Central African Republic	15 September 2024
18	Chad	12 September 2024
19	China	6 September 2024
20	Colombia	17 September 2024

⁵ The list will be updated during the sixteenth meeting of the Conference of the Parties to take any additional submissions received into account.

21	Comoros	1 August 2024
22	Cook Islands	16 October 2024
23	Costa Rica	2 August 2024
24	Côte d'Ivoire	15 October 2024
25	Croatia	2 August 2024
26	Cuba	25 July 2024
27	Cyprus	18 October 2024
28	Czechia	31 July 2024
29	Democratic Republic of the Congo	2 August 2024
30	Djibouti	15 August 2024
31	Dominican Republic	20 September 2024
32	Ecuador	31 August 2024
33	El Salvador	16 October 2024
34	Equatorial Guinea	13 September 2024
35	Eritrea	16 October 2024
36	Eswatini	31 July 2024
37	Ethiopia	5 July 2024
38	European Union	14 November 2023
39	Fiji	8 October 2024
40	Finland	19 August 2024
41	France	31 July 2024
42	Gabon	9 September 2024
43	Ghana	1 August 2024
44	Guatemala	13 August 2024
45	Guinea	8 October 2024
46	Honduras	31 July 2024
47	Hungary	2 July 2024
48	India	10 September 2024
49	Indonesia	12 September 2024
50	Ireland	20 August 2024
51	Israel	9 August 2024
52	Japan	31 July 2024
53	Jordan	3 August 2024
54	Kenya	31 July 2024
55	Lao People's Democratic Republic	9 October 2024
56	Lebanon	2 August 2024
57	Lesotho	27 September 2024
58	Liberia	3 August 2024
59	Libya	17 October 2024
60	Luxembourg	30 July 2024
61	Madagascar	29 July 2024
62	Malawi	31 July 2024
63	Malaysia	1 July 2024

64	Mali	17 October 2024
65	Malta	31 July 2024
66	Mexico	31 July 2024
67	Mongolia	4 August 2024
68	Morocco	2 August 2024
69	Mozambique	31 July 2024
70	Nepal	1 August 2024
71	New Zealand	7 October 2024
72	Niger	31 July 2024
73	Nigeria	31 July 2024
74	Pakistan	15 August 2024
75	Panama	31 July 2024
76	Papua New Guinea	14 October 2024
77	Paraguay	31 July 2024
78	Peru	18 October 2024
79	Republic of Korea	1 August 2024
80	Republic of Moldova	30 July 2024
81	Rwanda	1 August 2024
82	Saudi Arabia	15 October 2024
83	Senegal	24 August 2024
84	Sierra Leone	15 October 2024
85	Slovenia	17 October 2024
86	Somalia	19 August 2024
87	South Africa	18 October 2024
88	South Sudan	16 October 2024
89	Spain	22 July 2024
90	Sudan	26 July 2024
91	Sweden	3 July 2024
92	Togo	25 July 2024
93	Tonga	16 October 2024
94	Tunisia	15 October 2024
95	Türkiye	17 October 2024
96	Uganda	4 October 2024
97	United Arab Emirates	1 August 2024
98	United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland	1 August 2024
99	Uzbekistan	7 August 2024
100	Vanuatu	1 August 2024
101	Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of)	2 August 2024
102	Yemen	1 August 2024
103	Zimbabwe	9 October 2024

5/2. Pilot open-ended forum for voluntary country review of implementation at the fifth meeting of the Subsidiary Body on Implementation

The Subsidiary Body on Implementation,

Welcoming the participation of Parties, and noting the views shared by Parties during the pilot open-ended forum for voluntary country review conducted at its fifth meeting,

Taking note of the summary by the Chair of the Subsidiary Body on Implementation of the pilot open-ended forum,

Recommends that, when considering at its sixteenth meeting the draft decision on the enhanced multidimensional approach to planning, monitoring, reporting and review contained in recommendation 4/2 of the Subsidiary Body on Implementation, the Conference of the Parties include in its decision elements along the following lines:

The Conference of the Parties,

Recalling its decisions XIII/25 of 9 December 2016, 14/29 of 29 November 2018 and 15/6 of 19 December 2022,

1. *Takes note* of the views shared by Parties and the summary by the Chair of the Subsidiary Body on Implementation of the pilot open-ended forum for voluntary country review of implementation conducted at the fifth meeting of the Subsidiary Body;⁶

2. *[Requests* the Executive Secretary, subject to the availability of resources, under the guidance of the Bureau of the Conference of the Parties, to identify options for convening subregional or regional dialogues, taking into account the experiences and lessons learned from the previous regional dialogues,⁷ as well as a possible interregional dialogue, subject to the availability of resources, taking into account the experiences of the pilot open-ended forum convened at the fifth meeting of the Subsidiary Body.]

⁶ CBD/SBI/5/4, annex.

⁷ See www.cbd.int/nbsap.

II. Account of proceedings

Introduction

1. The fifth meeting of the Subsidiary Body on Implementation was attended by the following Parties to the Convention on Biological Diversity:

Algeria	France	Poland
Angola	Gabon	Republic of Korea
Antigua and Barbuda	Georgia	Republic of Moldova
Argentina	Germany	Russian Federation
Armenia	Ghana	Rwanda
Australia	Guatemala	Saint Kitts and Nevis
Austria	Guinea	Saint Lucia
Azerbaijan	Haiti	Sao Tome and Principe
Bahamas	Hungary	Saudi Arabia
Bangladesh	Iceland	Senegal
Barbados	India	Seychelles
Belgium	Indonesia	Sierra Leone
Benin	Iraq	Singapore
Bhutan	Ireland	Somalia
Bosnia and Herzegovina	Italy	South Africa
Brazil	Jamaica	Spain
Burkina Faso	Japan	Sri Lanka
Burundi	Jordan	Sudan
Cabo Verde	Kenya	Suriname
Cambodia	Kiribati	Sweden
Cameroon	Kyrgyzstan	Switzerland
Canada	Lao People's	Tajikistan
Central African Republic	Democratic Republic	Thailand
Chile	Lesotho	Togo
China	Liberia	Tonga
Colombia	Libya	Trinidad and Tobago
Comoros	Luxembourg	Tunisia
Cook Islands	Madagascar	Turkmenistan
Costa Rica	Malawi	Tuvalu
Cuba	Malaysia	Uganda
Czechia	Maldives	Ukraine
Côte d'Ivoire	Mauritius	United Arab Emirates
Democratic Republic of	Mexico	United Kingdom of
the Congo	Micronesia (Federated	Great Britain and
Denmark	States of)	Northern Ireland
Djibouti	Morocco	United Republic of
Dominican Republic	Mozambique	Tanzania
Ecuador	Namibia	Uruguay
Egypt	Nepal	Vanuatu
Equatorial Guinea	New Zealand	Venezuela (Bolivarian
Eswatini	Nigeria	Republic of)
Ethiopia	Norway	Zambia
European Union	Pakistan	Zimbabwe
Fiji	Paraguay	
Finland	Peru	

2. The following States not party to the Convention were also represented: Holy See and United States of America.

3. The meeting was also attended by observers from the following United Nations bodies, specialized agencies, convention secretariats and other bodies and organizations:

Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations	United Nations country team in Colombia
Global Environment Facility	United Nations Development Programme
Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights	United Nations Entity for Gender Equality and the Empowerment of Women (UN-Women)
Permanent Forum on Indigenous Issues	United Nations Environment Programme
Secretariat of the International Treaty on Plant Genetic Resources for Food and Agriculture	United Nations Environment Programme World Conservation Monitoring Centre
Secretariat of the Minamata Convention on Mercury	United Nations Office for Project Services World Health Organization

4. Information on participation in the meeting is available in information document CBD/SBI/5/INF/1.

Item 1

Organizational matters

(a) Opening of the meeting

5. The meeting was opened at 10.15 a.m. on 16 October 2024 by the Chair, Chirra Achalender Reddy (India).

6. After welcoming participants to the meeting, the Chair spoke briefly about the Kunming-Montreal Global Biodiversity Framework and the role of the Subsidiary Body in reviewing and enhancing the effectiveness of the implementation of the Convention and the Framework. The four goals and 23 targets of the Framework covered the full range of biodiversity topics, such as reclamation of degraded ecosystems, protection of terrestrial, marine and water areas, finance and health. In his view, the most important and complex topic was digital sequence information, which over the course of time Parties would discuss, debate and come to a consensus on that would be of benefit to all. Parties were expected to prepare national biodiversity strategies and action plans for achieving the goals and targets of the Framework, as well as their own national biodiversity targets according to their priorities, circumstances and capabilities, by 2030. It was important to recognize that preparing the national biodiversity strategies and action plans, along with national biodiversity targets aligned with the Framework, was a huge undertaking, in which it was essential to involve all stakeholders, including indigenous peoples and local communities, government agencies and non-government organizations.

7. Opening statements were made by the Minister of Environment and Sustainable Development of Colombia, Susana Muhamad, the Deputy Director General of the Department of Nature and Ecology Conservation of China, Ning Liu, on behalf of the President of the fifteenth meeting of the Conference of the Parties, the Minister of Ecology and Environment of China, Huang Runqiu, and the Executive Secretary of the Secretariat of the Convention, Astrid Schomaker.

8. In a video address, the Minister of Environment and Sustainable Development of Colombia welcomed participants to Cali, a city surrounded by the biological and cultural diversity of the Pacific. She expressed the hope that the setting would prove conducive to productive dialogue and deliberations, leading to consensus on all items on the agenda of the present meeting. Over the next

few days, the Subsidiary Body had the extraordinary challenge of sending the Conference of the Parties a clear message on the status of implementation of the Framework, with a special emphasis on the open-ended forum for voluntary country review. The world was at a crossroads where biodiversity loss, climate change and pollution were destroying the web of life, and stronger commitment by all Parties was needed at the national and local levels, along with the mobilization of the whole of society and the whole of government, to define an ambitious path for achieving transformative changes toward the sustainability of the planet, economies and society. That required rigorous monitoring, based on scientific knowledge and capacity, but also on dialogue with ancestral knowledge and local communities, especially those on the front lines that lived with the impact of the crises. That dialogue and those social agreements, along with the availability of agile, innovative and direct finance, would be key to fulfilling the implementation commitments made by all Parties at the fifteenth meeting of the Conference of the Parties. She wished the participants success in their deliberations while reminding them that their work was building towards peace with nature.

9. The Deputy Director General of the Department of Nature and Ecology Conservation of China, speaking on behalf of the President of the fifteenth meeting of the Conference of the Parties, also welcomed delegates to Cali, a city known for its rich cultural heritage and biodiversity. The present meeting was the last to be held under the presidency of his country before the baton was handed to Colombia, marking the beginning of a new phase, with new challenges but also new opportunities. The adoption of the Framework had set the direction for global biodiversity conservation for the next decade and beyond. Parties were now taking the first step in implementing the Framework, by developing their national biodiversity strategies and action plans to support national targets. He expressed the hope that the discussions at the present meeting would provide the inspiration needed by those still engaged in the process of completing them. Setting national targets was nevertheless only the first step in implementing the Framework, and effective implementation was key. China had taken the practical step of establishing the Kunming Biodiversity Fund with an initial investment of 1.5 billion yuan. The Fund had been launched in December 2023, with an official launch in May 2024 marked by the signature of a cooperation agreement with the United Nations Environment Programme and the Office of the Multilateral Fund for the Implementation of the Montreal Protocol in Beijing. Project assessment had begun, and he hoped that a first set of projects would be approved and fundraising guidelines for future projects would be produced during the sixteenth meeting of the Conference of the Parties. Noting that the Action Initiative for the Framework launched by China in December 2023 had also drawn widespread international attention, with 27 Parties and institutions having joined to date, he called upon developed and developing countries to use the Fund to support the implementation of the Framework. In closing, he called upon countries and organizations to work together to find solutions and achieve a positive impact and pledged to work with the Bureau, the Chair, the Secretariat and all delegates to ensure a successful meeting.

10. In her remarks, the Executive Secretary noted the opportunity presented by the present meeting to review the development of national biodiversity strategies and action plans and national targets, as well as their alignment with the Framework. Over the past two years, Parties had focused on preparing their national biodiversity strategies and action plans and, to date, 29 Parties had submitted their national biodiversity strategies and action plans and 91 had submitted national targets. With many targets now in place, it was time to shift the focus to implementation. The Framework was humanity's blueprint for halting and reversing biodiversity loss and recognized linkages to many other issues, which was both its strength and its challenge. To achieve its goals by 2030, however, Parties would need to deliver more, and faster. To succeed in its work, the Subsidiary Body had to reckon with the inherent complexity of gauging the effectiveness of action to protect biodiversity. The adoption of the Framework had tamed that inherent complexity by introducing 23 measurable targets grounded in science and lessons learned from the pursuit of the Aichi Biodiversity Targets. It was now time to review the progress made and determine the way forward. One reliable gauge of progress was the state of play in the alignment of national biodiversity strategies and action plans and national targets with the Framework. In 2023 and 2024, the Secretariat had convened a series of dialogues to facilitate the sharing of experiences and peer learning related to the revision and updating

of national biodiversity strategies and action plans. The outcomes of those dialogues would feed into the discussions at the present meeting, where the first order of business was to review progress with implementation.

(b) Adoption of the agenda and organization of work

Election of the Rapporteur for the meeting

11. At its 1st plenary session, on 16 October, the Subsidiary Body agreed that Moustafa Fouda (Egypt) would act as Rapporteur for the meeting.

12. The Rapporteur made a statement of thanks on behalf of all participants.

Adoption of the agenda

13. At its 1st plenary session, the Subsidiary Body adopted the following agenda on the basis of the provisional agenda prepared by the Secretariat:⁸

1. Organizational matters:
 - (a) Opening of the meeting;
 - (b) Adoption of the agenda and organization of work.
2. Review of implementation of the Kunming-Montreal Global Biodiversity Framework, including means of implementation.
3. Other matters.
4. Adoption of the report.
5. Closure of the meeting.

Organization of work

14. Also at its 1st plenary session, the Subsidiary Body approved the proposed organization of work.⁹

Item 2

Review of implementation of the Kunming-Montreal Global Biodiversity Framework, including means of implementation

15. The Subsidiary Body began its consideration of agenda item 2 at its 1st plenary session. It had before it notes by the Secretariat on: review of implementation: progress in national target-setting and updating of national biodiversity strategies and action plans, which included a draft recommendation;¹⁰ an analysis of national biodiversity strategies and action plans revised and updated aligned with the Framework;¹¹ an analysis of targets established by Parties aligned with the Framework;¹² a summary of key findings from regional and subregional dialogues on national biodiversity strategies and action plans;¹³ and the pilot open-ended forum for voluntary country review of implementation at the fifth meeting of the Subsidiary Body, which included a draft recommendation.¹⁴ In addition, all the findings from the dialogues were available as reference documents on the meeting web page.¹⁵

⁸ CBD/SBI/5/1.

⁹ CBD/SBI/5/1/Add.2, annex I.

¹⁰ CBD/SBI/5/2/Rev.1.

¹¹ CBD/SBI/5/2/Add.1/Rev.1.

¹² CBD/SBI/5/2/Add.2/Rev.1.

¹³ CBD/SBI/5/2/Add.3.

¹⁴ CBD/SBI/5/3.

¹⁵ See www.cbd.int/conferences/2024/sbi-05/documents.

General statements

16. Statements were made by representatives of the following Parties: Argentina, Armenia, Azerbaijan, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Brazil, Canada, Colombia, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Djibouti, Ethiopia, European Union and its member States, Ghana, Guatemala, Japan, Jordan, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Malaysia, Maldives, Mexico, Morocco, Nepal, New Zealand, Nigeria, Norway, Russian Federation, Saudi Arabia, Senegal (on behalf of the African States), Seychelles, Somalia, South Africa, Switzerland, Togo, Uganda, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay and Zimbabwe.

17. At its 2nd plenary session, on 16 October, the Subsidiary Body resumed its consideration of agenda item 2.

18. Statements were made by representatives of the following Parties: Algeria, Bangladesh, Benin, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cameroon, Chile, China, Dominican Republic, Guinea, Haiti, India, Indonesia, Jamaica, Kenya, Lesotho, Liberia, Libya, Malawi, Peru, Republic of Moldova, Sierra Leone, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Vanuatu (on behalf of the Pacific Islands represented at the meeting) and Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of).

19. Statements were also made by representatives of the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations, the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights, the Secretariat of the International Treaty on Plant Genetic Resources for Food and Agriculture, the Secretariat of the Pacific Regional Environment Programme, the United Nations Development Programme and the United Nations Entity for Gender Equality and the Empowerment of Women (UN-Women).

20. Further statements were made by representatives of the CBD Women's Caucus, the Global Youth Biodiversity Network, the International Indigenous Forum on Biodiversity and Ecosystem Services, the Indigenous Women Network on Biodiversity from Latin America and the Caribbean and the International Union for Conservation of Nature.

21. Following the exchange of views, the Chair said that he would prepare a draft recommendation, in consultation with the Secretariat, for consideration by the Subsidiary Body, taking into account the views expressed by Parties.

22. At the 4th plenary session, on 17 October, the Chair established a group of friends of the Chair, facilitated by Andrea Cruz Angón (Mexico), to assist him in streamlining the text of the draft recommendation.

23. At its 5th plenary session, on 18 October, following a report by the facilitator of the group of friends of the Chair on the group's work, the Subsidiary Body considered a draft recommendation submitted by the Chair on review of implementation: progress in national target setting and updating of national biodiversity strategies and action plans.

24. Statements were made by representatives of the following Parties: Argentina, Brazil, Cameroon, Canada, Colombia, Cuba, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Egypt, European Union and its member States, Gabon, Iraq, Mexico, New Zealand, Pakistan, Peru, Russian Federation, South Africa, Togo, Turkmenistan and Uganda.

25. At its 6th plenary session, on 18 October, the Subsidiary Body resumed its consideration of the draft recommendation.

26. Statements were made by representatives of the following Parties: Argentina, Australia, Bangladesh, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Brazil, Canada, Chile, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Djibouti, Egypt, Ethiopia, European Union and its member States, Gabon, Ghana, India, Jamaica, Japan, Mexico, New Zealand, Nigeria, Pakistan, Russian Federation, Senegal, South Africa, Switzerland, Togo, Uganda, United Republic of Tanzania and Zimbabwe.

27. Following the exchange of views, the Subsidiary Body approved the draft recommendation, as orally amended, as draft recommendation CBD/SBI/5/L.2, for formal adoption.

28. The representative of the Democratic Republic of the Congo expressed a reservation regarding the process leading to the approval of the draft recommendation.

29. The Subsidiary Body subsequently adopted draft recommendation CBD/SBI/5/L.2 as recommendation 5/1 (see sect. I).

Pilot open-ended forum for voluntary country review

30. At the 2nd plenary session, the Chair opened the pilot open-ended forum for voluntary country review. The forum was facilitated by Natasha Walker and Martín Sánchez Vilchis and consisted of three thematic sessions in addition to the opening session.

31. The representative of the Secretariat introduced document CBD/SBI/5/3 and drew attention to additional information on the pilot forum in the scenario note for the meeting.¹⁶

32. The Subsidiary Body then heard from a panel comprising representatives of Parties that had hosted dialogues on national biodiversity strategies and action plans, who shared some of what they had heard during the dialogues. The panellists were Taimur al-Said, Environmental Specialist, Office for Conservation of the Environment, Environment Authority of Oman; Bilal Abdel-Hamid Moh'd Qteshat, Director, Nature Protection Directorate, Ministry of Environment of Jordan; Roxana Virginia Solis Ortiz, Coordinator of Biological Diversity Instrument Management, Ecosystem and Species Conservation Directorate, Ministry of the Environment of Peru; and Nozanin Rasulova, Head, Department of Sectoral and Intersectoral Cooperation for the Implementation of the Convention on Biological Diversity and its Protocols, National Biodiversity and Biosafety Centre, Tajikistan.

Session 1: whole-of-government and whole-of-society approaches and integration of the Protocols and other multilateral environmental agreements into national biodiversity strategies and action plans

33. The first thematic session of the forum was held during the 3rd plenary session, on 17 October.

34. The session was chaired by Norbert Bärlocher (Switzerland) and consisted of a panel discussion followed by an open dialogue with representatives of Parties and observers, facilitated by the facilitators.

35. At the start of the session, the Chair made introductory remarks and introduced the panellists, consisting of Angela Lozan, Project Manager, National Office for Implementation of Environmental Projects, Ministry of the Environment of the Republic of Moldova; Andrea Cruz Angón, Biodiversity Expert, National Commission for Biodiversity Knowledge and Use of Mexico; Nicolas Laurent, Biodiversity Coordinator for European and International Affairs, Directorate for Planning, Housing and Nature, Ministry of Ecological Transition and Territorial Cohesion of France; Krishneel Nand, Acting Principal Environmental Officer, Ministry of Environment and Climate Change, Department of Environment of Fiji; Moustafa Fouda, Minister Adviser of Biodiversity Matters, Ministry of Environment of Egypt; and Claudia Valeria Sánchez Flores of Mexico, a member of the Indigenous Women Network on Biodiversity – Mexico.

36. Following the interactive discussion, the Chair summarized the key messages emerging from the discussion and closed the session.

Session 2: national target setting and monitoring

37. The second thematic session of the forum started during the 3rd plenary session and continued during the 4th plenary session.

¹⁶ CBD/SBI/5/1/Add.2.

38. The session was chaired by Somaly Chan (Cambodia) and consisted of a panel discussion followed by an open dialogue with representatives of Parties and observers, facilitated by the facilitators.

39. At the start of the session, the Chair made introductory remarks and introduced the panellists, consisting of Ditta Greguss, Biodiversity Policy Adviser, Ministry of Agriculture of Hungary; Iemdaad Rodjan, Acting Deputy Permanent Secretary, Ministry of Spatial Planning and Environment of Suriname; Moumouni Ouedraogo, Inspector for Water and Forests, Permanent Secretariat of the National Council for Sustainable Development, Ministry of the Environment, Energy, Water and Health of Burkina Faso; Wataru Suzuki, Director, Biodiversity Strategy Office, Ministry of the Environment of Japan; Jane Stratford, Deputy Head, International Biodiversity and Climate, Department of Environment, Food and Rural Affairs of the United Kingdom; and Priyanka Pandey, Biodiversity Hub International.

40. Following the interactive discussion, the Chair summarized the key messages emerging from the discussion and closed the session.

Session 3: means of implementation, including national biodiversity finance planning and capacity-development planning

41. The third thematic session of the forum took place during the 4th plenary session.

42. The session was chaired by Teona Karchava (Georgia) and consisted of a panel discussion followed by an open dialogue with representatives of Parties and observers, facilitated by the facilitators.

43. At the start of the session, the Chair made introductory remarks and introduced the panellists, consisting of Tsepang Makholela, Chief Director, Biodiversity Monitoring and Specialist Services, Forestry, Fisheries and Environment, Department of Environmental Affairs of South Africa; Liu Yan, Professor, Nanjing Institute of Environmental Sciences, Ministry of Ecology and Environment of China; Rashad Allahverdiyev, Deputy Head, Service of Protection of Biodiversity, Ministry of Ecology and Natural Resources of Azerbaijan; Mauricio Cabrera Leal, Vice-Minister, Environmental Policies and Regulations, Ministry of Environment and Sustainable Development of Colombia; Anne Teller, Senior Expert, Directorate-General for Environment of the European Commission; and Camari Divuniwaqa, a member of the Global Youth Biodiversity Network.

44. Following the interactive discussion, the Chair summarized the key messages emerging from the discussion and closed the session.

Closing session

45. At the 5th plenary session, the Chair presented his summary of the key messages of the forum. The Chair's summary is set out in the annex to the present report.

Recommendation

46. At its 6th plenary session, the Subsidiary Body considered a draft recommendation submitted by the Chair on the pilot open-ended forum for voluntary country review of implementation at the fifth meeting of the Subsidiary Body.

47. Statements were made by representatives of the following Parties: Argentina, Brazil, Colombia, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Egypt, European Union and its member States, Gabon, Georgia, Jamaica, Mexico, New Zealand, Russian Federation, Saudi Arabia and Somalia.

48. Following the exchange of views, the Subsidiary Body approved the draft recommendation, as orally amended, and adopted it as recommendation 5/2 (see sect. I).

49. The representative of the Democratic Republic of the Congo requested that the termination of interpretation services and intermittent availability of Internet service during the negotiation of the draft recommendation be noted in the present report.

Item 3

Other matters

50. No other matters were raised.

Item 4

Adoption of the report

51. At its 6th plenary session, the Subsidiary Body adopted the present report, as orally amended, on the basis of the draft report prepared by the Rapporteur,¹⁷ on the understanding that the Rapporteur would be entrusted with its finalization.

Item 5

Closure of the meeting

52. Following the customary exchange of courtesies, the meeting was declared closed at 7.20 p.m. on 18 October 2024.

¹⁷ CBD/SBI/5/L.1.

Annex

Chair's summary of the discussions held during the pilot open-ended forum for voluntary country review of implementation at the fifth meeting of the Subsidiary Body on Implementation

1. At its fifth meeting, the Subsidiary Body on Implementation piloted an open-ended forum for voluntary country review according to the modus operandi provided in document CBD/SBI/4/4/Add.1 and procedures outlined in document CBD/SBI/5/3.
2. The open-ended forum consisted of an opening session and three substantive sessions addressing:
 - (a) The whole-of-government and whole-of-society approach and the integration of the Protocols to the Convention on Biological Diversity and other multilateral environmental agreements into national biodiversity strategies and action plans;
 - (b) National target setting and monitoring;
 - (c) Means of implementation, including national biodiversity finance planning and capacity-development planning.
3. The open-ended forum was interactive and focused on the experiences of Parties and observers in implementing the Convention and, in particular, on the efforts of Parties and observers to implement the Kunming-Montreal Global Biodiversity Framework at the national level.
4. The present document contains a summary of the points raised during the open-ended forum. It was prepared by the Chair of the Subsidiary Body on Implementation, in consultation with the chairs of each session. The text has not been negotiated by Parties, and the points raised in the summary should not be taken to mean that an agreement was reached on any particular issue.

Opening session

5. The opening session set the stage for those that followed and gave participants the opportunity to highlight experiences relevant to issues discussed in the thematic sessions. The following points were raised, with some being addressed in more detail in later sessions:
 - (a) Positive examples of how elevating political will improved the whole-of-government and whole-of-society approach would be crucial for implementation;
 - (b) There were different world views with clear implications for the development and implementation of national biodiversity strategies and action plans;
 - (c) Examples were given of challenges in meaningfully engaging with some actors, as they might have different objectives, knowledge and needs;
 - (d) Regional cooperation was important, given the transboundary nature of biodiversity;
 - (e) The variety of institutional settings remained a barrier at the regional level, as different countries had ratified different agreements and protocols. In that regard, some noted that there was a need for synergistic cooperation among environmental agreements at the international level;
 - (f) Competing political priorities, such as security and desertification/land degradation, remained a challenge to implementation. However, some also noted that the synergistic implementation of measures related to climate change, desertification/land degradation and biodiversity were crucial;
 - (g) Funding, including its disbursement and allocation, remained a challenge. Some noted that there were differences among countries in the accessibility and availability of financial resources,

which had an impact on how countries could implement the Convention and cooperate with one another.

Session 1: whole-of-government and whole-of-society approach and integration of the Protocols to the Convention on Biological Diversity and other multilateral environmental agreements into national biodiversity strategies and action plans

6. Participants reflected on the key factors that contributed to successful coordination, communication, institutional arrangements and mechanisms for meaningful participation, as well as innovative approaches for engagement. The points that were raised by several representatives of Parties included the following:

(a) A whole-of-government and whole-of-society approach and the integration of other relevant multilateral environmental agreements were important for the effective revision, updating and implementation of national biodiversity strategies and action plans;

(b) Engaging across government and sectors in the process of revising and updating national biodiversity strategies and action plans was important. The ministries dealing with productive sectors, such as those responsible for fisheries, mining and agriculture, as well as the ministries of finance and economy, were identified as particularly important in this regard;

(c) The Protocols were technically complex and their implementation required specialized skills. It was indicated that the implementation, integration and mainstreaming of the Protocols into the national biodiversity strategies and action plans required specific expertise, and that dialogues, workshops and capacity-building could facilitate that process;

(d) Time investment in awareness-raising, knowledge-sharing, communication and media, incentives and an adequate structure for coordination were key elements to take into account in the implementation of the whole-of-government and whole-of-society approach;

(e) The mapping of stakeholders could support the effective implementation of a whole-of-government and whole-of-society approach, including the recognition that some might have dual roles as both users and “caretakers” of biodiversity;

(f) It was important to use and leverage good practices in relation to indigenous peoples and local communities, women and youth engagement, for example in consultations and project design;

(g) Meaningful dialogue with indigenous peoples and local communities needed to be strengthened at all levels, which required resources and effective coordination mechanisms;

(h) Academic and research organizations also played an important role in the revision and updating of national biodiversity strategies and action plans and in monitoring in support of effective implementation;

(i) Domestic institutional arrangements and contexts were important determinants of national capacities and needed to be taken into account in national biodiversity strategies and action plans, the implementation of a whole-of-government and whole-of-society approach and the integration of other relevant multilateral environmental agreements;

(j) Political will and the rule of law played an important role;

(k) The development of national biodiversity strategies and action plans could benefit from regional coordination among neighbouring countries;

(l) National biodiversity strategies and action plans should use incentives for partners and stakeholders to take actions;

(m) The inclusive participation and representation of stakeholders at all stages and across generations required a concerted and sustained effort. It required resources, the provision of platforms and mechanisms, and other opportunities for meaningful engagement;

(n) Meaningful dialogue was a key element that needed to be encouraged, including through innovative and effective consultative processes, such as citizen assemblies, and the use of interactive exchange platforms (from local to national level, and vice versa);

(o) Good practices for the implementation of national biodiversity strategies and action plans that used a whole-of-society and whole-of-government approach included:

(i) Additional efforts, in particular in terms of ensuring the participation and interaction of women, youth and indigenous peoples and local communities;

(ii) Engagement with other ministries, which could be facilitated through management structures, coordination mechanisms and processes, such as the Bern Process, that facilitated cooperation and synergies among the focal points of different sectors, conventions and multilateral environmental agreements;

(p) It was important to engage with youth, and youth could also proactively engage national Governments in various manners and through various means in processes for developing and implementing national biodiversity strategies and action plans. Such processes could result in a variety of outcomes and generate specific lessons learned on effective participation, in particular at the subnational level;

(q) Governments should report to local communities that depended on ecosystem services, such as fishing, on the ongoing implementation of national biodiversity strategies and action plans.

Session 2: national target setting and monitoring

7. Participants reflected on the key factors for successfully reflecting the Framework in national processes and policies. They also discussed elements critical to setting and monitoring national targets. Participants expressed interest in learning more about the tools developed by others. The points that were raised by several representatives of Parties included the following:

(a) The involvement of rights holders and stakeholders had great value for the comprehensive development of national biodiversity strategies and action plans and national targets and helped to bring benefits to the groups involved, while also supporting effective implementation, but it could be challenging to involve all rights holders and stakeholders in the development of national targets and to take into account the perspectives and ambitions of everyone, and meaningful involvement required resources, the provision of accessible platforms and opportunities for meaningful dialogues and engagement;

(b) Capacity development, communication, awareness-raising and knowledge-sharing were essential for developing national biodiversity strategies and action plans and setting and implementing national targets. Dialogue was a key element that needed to be encouraged;

(c) Flexible approaches were useful for setting and implementing national targets in decentralized systems, while coordination was required to ensure that joint efforts would be made to achieve commonly shared national targets;

(d) Decentralizing the collection of data, for example by using various government institutions and processes or engaging with civil society, other government institutions and partners, could help to support effective monitoring of implementation;

(e) Having other ministries lead the planning and development of some national targets allowed responsibilities to be spread out and enhanced shared accountability across government. In that respect, some noted that engagement with other ministries could be facilitated through interministerial structures and the identification of focal points and contact points;

- (f) Coordination with the national focal points for the Protocols and for other multilateral environmental agreements helped to develop synergies in target-setting and monitoring;
- (g) At the national level, some targets might have higher prioritization;
- (h) A review of existing laws and institutions could provide a basis for developing ambitious but realistic targets in line with the Framework;
- (i) Legal and policy clarity and coherence were essential for setting and implementing national targets to ensure that all actors contributed to implementation. A common and legally binding framework for biodiversity was cited as an important component to bolster implementation;
- (j) National monitoring systems underpinned decision-making, but there were gaps in those systems, and significant resources might be required to develop them.

Session 3: means of implementation, including national biodiversity finance planning and capacity-development planning

8. Participants reflected on means of implementation, including national biodiversity finance planning and capacity-development planning. Participants used the session to share experiences and good practices and identify current needs, gaps and challenges related to capacity-building and financing for the development and implementation of national biodiversity strategies and action plans. The points that were raised by several representatives of Parties included the following:

- (a) The process for national biodiversity strategy and action plan development was a good opportunity for identifying funding needs and attracting additional finance from diverse sources, including the private sector and philanthropic organizations;
- (b) Conducting an analysis of existing financing, costing national biodiversity strategies plans and associated actions, determining current gaps and identifying sustainable financing models to address such gaps, including through innovative financing solutions, provided a strong foundation for implementation;
- (c) Securing strong commitment and tracking the biodiversity expenditure of all ministries, based on their mandates, could help to ensure sustained commitment and improve implementation;
- (d) Innovative financing solutions were highlighted, including payment for ecosystem services, green bonds, debt-for-nature and debt-for-climate swaps, tourist payments, private sector contributions, taxes, carbon credits, microcredits and fiscal transfers (e.g. to subnational governments to encourage local conservation efforts);
- (e) Public financing remained the main source of finance for biodiversity, even though the need to diversify sources was underlined. Domestic financing could be enhanced, for example, by establishing or strengthening national financing mechanisms and for the adoption of short- and long-term domestic finance plans;
- (f) There were co-benefits to integrating climate and biodiversity finance, while some cautioned that measures needed to be taken to avoid double counting;
- (g) Identifying national priorities to guide the allocation of a national budget to biodiversity, including by engaging with various ministries and agencies, could support resource allocation;
- (h) The need to focus on domestic sources of funding, both public and private, was underlined, while some stressed the importance of increasing external sources of funding;
- (i) It was important to engage ministries of finance and planning proactively for them to recognize the critical contribution of biodiversity and ecosystem services to the national economy, and to make the business case for biodiversity to the private sector;
- (j) Experience was needed in conducting capacity-needs assessment for national biodiversity strategies and action plans, including in the mapping of skills required for the

implementation of specific targets in national biodiversity strategies and action plans, such as restoration;

(k) There were needs related to the capacity for monitoring the achievement of national targets, the development of national capacity-building plans, and data and knowledge gaps;

(l) Steps were undertaken to address the identified capacity needs and gaps, including in terms of the development of human resource development strategies, targeted training for specific skills, the placement of young graduates in biodiversity-related organizations and the development of institutional capacity for research to support the implementation of biodiversity-related programmes;

(m) There was a need to strengthen the capacity of stakeholders, including youth, women and local authorities at various levels, to contribute to the development and implementation of national biodiversity strategies and action plans.
