



## Convention on Biological Diversity

Distr.: General  
8 September 2024

Original: English

---

### Subsidiary Body on Implementation

#### Fifth meeting

Cali, Colombia, 16–18 October 2024

Item 2 of the provisional agenda\*

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

### Summary of key findings from regional and subregional dialogues on national biodiversity strategies and action plans\*\*

Note by the Secretariat

## I. Introduction

1. In its decision 15/4, the Conference of the Parties to the Convention on Biological Diversity adopted the Kunming-Montreal Global Biodiversity Framework and noted that its implementation would be supported by decisions 15/5, 15/6, 15/7, 15/8, 15/9 and 15/13, which it affirmed to be of equal standing to the Framework. The Conference of the Parties also noted that the implementation of the Framework would be supported by relevant decisions adopted by the Conference of the Parties serving as the meetings of the Parties to the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety and the Nagoya Protocol on Access to Genetic Resources and the Fair and Equitable Sharing of Benefits Arising from their Utilization, in particular the Implementation Plan for the Cartagena Protocol and the Capacity building Action Plan for the Cartagena Protocol.

2. In its decision 15/6, the Conference of the Parties adopted an enhanced multidimensional approach to planning, monitoring, reporting and review, with national biodiversity strategies and action plans, revised or updated in alignment with the Framework and its goals and targets, as the main vehicle for the implementation of the Framework. The Conference of the Parties requested Parties to revise and update their national biodiversity strategies and action plans and to submit them by the sixteenth meeting of the Conference of the Parties. In its decision 15/7, the Conference of the Parties encouraged Parties to develop, update and implement national biodiversity finance plans or similar instruments, on the basis of the national biodiversity strategies and action plans. In its decision 15/8, the Conference of the Parties urged Parties to integrate capacity-building and development components in their updated national biodiversity strategies and action plans, and/or to develop dedicated biodiversity capacity-building and development action plans, and programmes, as appropriate and requested the Executive Secretary to support and advise Parties on ways of doing so.

3. In its decision 15/6, the Conference of the Parties also requested the Executive Secretary to support the operationalization of the enhanced multidimensional approach to planning, monitoring,

---

\* CBD/SBI/5/1.

\*\* The present document provides an update to document CBD/SBI/4/INF/6 and is being issued without formal editing.

reporting and review, including by collaborating with relevant partners to provide necessary capacity-building and other support, and by supporting the Subsidiary Body on Implementation in the further development and piloting of a modus operandi of an open-ended forum for the voluntary country review of implementation.

4. Pursuant to those decisions, since August 2023, the Secretariat has organized a series of regional and subregional dialogues on national biodiversity strategies and action plans with a dual purpose of (a) supporting national biodiversity strategy and action plan development and implementation through the sharing of experiences, good practices and lessons learned, including ways and means to address challenges; and (b) contributing to the development of the pilot open-ended forum for the voluntary country review of implementation under the Subsidiary Body on Implementation, requested by the Conference of the Parties in its decision 15/6 and described in document CBD/SBI/4/4/Add.1.<sup>1</sup>

5. Twelve dialogues were conducted between August 2023 and September 2024.<sup>2</sup> At the closing of each dialogue, participants agreed on a summary of key points or conclusions that had emerged from the discussions, including common challenges, lessons learned, best practices and opportunities.<sup>3</sup> The present document contains an overview of the content and format of the dialogues (sect. II) and a summary and conclusion of the findings from these dialogues (sect. III).

## **I. Content and format of the dialogues**

6. The dialogues conducted thus far have been tailored to meet the needs of the countries attending, while also aiming to include common elements. They have all included sessions related to the following:

(a) Sharing experiences and lessons learned in revising or updating national biodiversity strategies and action plans, including discussions related to:

- (i) Whole-of-government and whole-of-society approaches: including institutional arrangements or mechanisms established for engaging relevant ministries, sectors, indigenous peoples and local communities and relevant stakeholders in the process of updating or revising national biodiversity strategies and action plans, the challenges encountered, the underlying root causes and possible ways to enhance coordination, collaboration and engagement;
- (ii) Integration of relevant issues related to the Cartagena and Nagoya Protocols and other multilateral environmental agreements into national biodiversity strategies and action plans, as appropriate: including discussions on how such integration can be done, depending on national contexts;
- (iii) National target setting or revision: including progress made in setting or revising national targets, alignment of the national targets with the scope and ambition of the global targets, challenges encountered, and support needed;
- (iv) The development of national monitoring plans: including the current status, the national monitoring needs and the implementation of the headline indicators;
- (v) Challenges and opportunities for the overall revision or updating of national biodiversity strategies and action plans: a summary discussion on the issues and challenges for the overall revision or updating of national biodiversity strategies

---

<sup>1</sup> The dialogues have been organized with the financial support of the Governments of Japan, through the Japan Biodiversity Fund, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, Denmark, and from the European Union, in collaboration with various organizations and partners listed in the annex of the present note.

<sup>2</sup> See the annex for the list of dialogues.

<sup>3</sup> The reports of the dialogues are available at [www.cbd.int/nbsap](http://www.cbd.int/nbsap).

and action plans and possible solutions or opportunities to address the issues and challenges.

(b) The development of complementary instruments to address the means of implementation of the national biodiversity strategies and action plans:

- (i) Capacity-building and development: capacity needs, challenges and opportunities as well as ways and means of developing national capacity-building and development plans or integrating capacity-building and development components in the national biodiversity strategy and action plan;
- (ii) National biodiversity finance plans: discussion on tools and lessons learned in developing national biodiversity finance plans, including on the use of the Biodiversity Finance Initiative (BIOFIN) methodology.

7. For each dialogue, Parties were invited to nominate two representatives to attend and it was advised that one nominee should be the national focal point for the Convention or a government official who is responsible for leading the work on revising and updating the national biodiversity strategy and action plan, and the second nominee could be an officer or expert who is involved in the revision or updating of the national biodiversity strategy and action plan, in particular working on issues related to capacity-building and development or financing. In submitting nominations, Parties were advised to consider the full range of relevant national stakeholders, including the national focal points of the Cartagena and Nagoya Protocols. In addition, at each dialogue, representatives from major stakeholder groups were invited, including representatives from indigenous peoples and local communities, women and youth. The Secretariat also identified and invited other stakeholders and organizations relevant at the regional or subregional level.

8. Participants in the dialogues prepared national presentations, shared experiences in revising or updating their national biodiversity strategy and action plan and contributed to the discussion on challenges and opportunities. In some dialogues participants also prepared draft templates for their capacity-building and development action plan to be further elaborated with relevant stakeholders at the national level. The dialogues were conducted in an informal setting, each involving a small number of countries, which allowed for open discussions and information sharing. Additionally, in each of the dialogues, participants expressed an interest in improving networks and sharing of experiences with other countries to enhance national implementation. Many countries were of the view that good practices, solutions or opportunities to address challenges that emerged from the discussions during the dialogues would be very helpful for their updating or revising the national biodiversity strategy and action plan. Representatives of indigenous peoples and local communities, women and youth and relevant organizations that participated in the dialogues also shared their perspectives and inputs on the updating or revision of the national biodiversity strategy and action plan, which countries found useful.

9. Informal regional or subregional dialogues could provide a mechanism for facilitating country reviews during the implementation of the Framework. The mutual learning and peer exchange that take place in these dialogues can be an important source of support for Parties in their implementation efforts. The dialogues are aimed at highlighting common needs and good practices, which can provide a basis for discussion in the open-ended forum for voluntary country review to be held during the fifth session of the Subsidiary Body on Implementation.

## **II. Summary of key findings from regional and subregional dialogues on national biodiversity strategies and action plans**

10. During each dialogue, participants from each country shared lessons learned and experiences on one of the topics described below. In addition, participants provided an update of the status of the process for revising or updating their country's national biodiversity strategy and action plan. Most

of the countries participating in the dialogues have already started or are preparing to start revising or updating their national biodiversity strategy and action plan.

11. During the dialogues, participants from some countries indicated that the national biodiversity strategy and action plan process had experienced delays or challenges related to the implementation of the Global Environment Facility project that supports the updating or revising of national biodiversity strategies and action plans. Specific challenges noted included a lack of involvement and ownership by countries in the project development and implementation; that national projects are not always facilitating genuine stakeholder engagement and capacity development; and difficulties in collaboration resulting from project funds not being transferred to the ministries or agencies leading the work on updating or revising national biodiversity strategies and action plans.

#### **A. Whole-of-government and whole-of society approach**

12. In each of the dialogues, the importance and the need to use a whole-of-government and whole-of-society approach for the development and implementation of the national biodiversity strategy and action plan was discussed. This is particularly important given the broad range of issues covered by the Framework and the need to reflect Targets 14 to 23 and section C of the Framework in the national biodiversity strategy and action plan.

13. Good practices in promoting a whole-of-government and whole-of-society approach that were identified in the discussions, included:

(a) Stakeholder mapping as a way to identify relevant departments, sectors and stakeholders to be involved in the process, and to elaborate the roles and impacts of different actors on biodiversity;

(b) Using existing mechanisms, such as a national biodiversity strategy and action plan committee or working group, to improve the efficiency of the coordination process; and conducting an initiating national workshop or consultations involving the actors who have a strong role or impact related to biodiversity. Some countries appoint a dedicated national biodiversity strategy and action plan officer to coordinate the process and implementation of the national biodiversity strategy and action plan. Some countries have established target-specific groups to revise or set national targets and evaluate their implementation;

(c) Efforts to increase awareness and communication, which is essential for engagement and buy-in as well as ownership. This could include multiple means or approaches for consultation and engagement, such as the use of social media, strategic communication with policymakers, customized engagement approaches to be employed with different stakeholder groups and sectors, and raising awareness or commitments through various activities. Some countries held high-level national events as part of the consultation process. These events both raised awareness and increased ownership of the national biodiversity strategy and action plan;

(d) Improving coordination among related international and domestic processes to avoid possible consultation fatigue;

(e) Finding balance between the time needed for consultations and updating or revising the national biodiversity strategy and action plan with the need for having a plan established by the sixteenth meeting of the Conference of the Parties.

14. Challenges in implementing a whole-of-government and whole-of-society approach identified in the discussions, included:

(a) The time needed to engage stakeholders meaningfully, while attempting to meet the deadline of the sixteenth meeting of the Conference of the Parties;

(b) Practical difficulties in undertaking consultations with local communities if those communities are hard to reach (this is particularly relevant for small island developing States given the difficulty in reaching outer islands);

- (c) Difficulties in identifying and engaging those new stakeholders to address new issues or targets covered in the Framework, beyond the traditional biodiversity-based stakeholder groups;
- (d) A lack of interest, support, commitment and action from stakeholders, in some instances related to “consultation fatigue” resulting from too many international, regional and national processes ongoing in parallel;
- (e) A lack of awareness or understanding of some stakeholders of the Framework and related global goals and targets in national contexts;
- (f) A lack of political and financial support and resources in engaging stakeholders;
- (g) Capacity for strategic communication, in particular with sectoral actors not sympathetic or cooperative to biodiversity issues;
- (h) Difficulty in coordinating or in maintaining engagements caused by personnel turnover in related departments or the changing mandates of related departments.

## **B. Integration of the Protocols and relevant multilateral environmental agreements into the national biodiversity strategy and action plan**

15. At each dialogue, it was recognized that national biodiversity strategies and action plans could play an important role in facilitating synergetic implementation of the Convention, the Protocols and other multilateral environmental agreements. Each dialogue identified opportunities for improving integration. Goal C and Targets 13 and 17 of the Framework could provide important opportunities for strengthening the integration of issues addressed by the Protocols in the national biodiversity strategy and action plan. In addition, the endorsement of the Framework by the governing bodies of other multilateral environmental agreements provides an opportunity for integration and synergies. Climate change processes and food security issues have a higher level of awareness and resources available for implementation, thus improving integration may increase the attention given to biodiversity related issues. Integrating the Protocols into the national biodiversity strategy and action plan may increase the availability of resources and their efficient use for the implementation of the Protocols.

16. Several challenges in achieving integration were noted, including:

- (a) The high level of coordination required for development and implementation of targets and actions involving different government departments acting as focal points for the Protocols and relevant multilateral environmental agreements;
- (b) Insufficient human, technical, technological and financial resources needed for implementation, considering the diversity and magnitude of issues to be addressed in the different agreements;
- (c) Each Protocol and multilateral environmental agreement has its own process and actors at the national level, with different implementation requirements and thus it may be difficult to convince other processes and actors of the value of integration. Planning processes for the implementation of different instruments may not be undertaken in parallel, therefore countries are encouraged to link these interrelated processes.

## **C. Updating, revising or setting of national targets**

17. Most of the countries participating in the dialogues have already started or are preparing to start revising or updating their national targets and national biodiversity strategies and action plans. A few good practices noted in the dialogues, included:

- (a) Reviewing the existing national biodiversity strategy and action plan against the Framework in order to identify which targets need to be revised is an efficient starting point for identifying the scope of the revision or updating process and using this information to identify the

need for new targets, for upscaling or developing actions and for determining the means of implementation needed;

(b) Building on existing commitments and mobilizing new commitments from all relevant actors, including non-State actor commitments, including relevant targets already included in sectoral and cross-sectoral strategies and plans, as well as commitments made under relevant international and regional processes, such as nationally determined contributions under the Paris Agreement;

(c) Taking into account national circumstances and capabilities when revising or setting targets, in particular in order to address the key threats to biodiversity in the country;

(d) Using science-based assessments, data and information from various sources, including traditional knowledge relevant to biodiversity conservation, and use these to inform policy processes;

(e) Taking into account and linking with other relevant planning processes, such as national social and economic planning and the development of national strategies or plans for the implementation of the Sustainable Development Goals;

18. Challenges in revising or setting national targets in alignment with the Framework included:

(a) A lack of political support or commitment, a lack of funding or delays in the provision of funds, inadequate awareness of relevant stakeholders of the Framework, and a lack of commitments from some sectors and stakeholder groups that have impacts on biodiversity;

(b) Time needed for undertaking consultations with relevant government ministries, sectors and stakeholders;

(c) Lack of availability of data or assessments, including baseline data on biodiversity related status and trends and on reviewing implementation of existing national biodiversity strategies and action plans and targets;

(d) Difficulty in contextualizing or communicating the Framework at the national level;

(e) Difficulty in identifying adequate national contributions to the global targets of the Framework or a mismatch in the levels of ambition and specificity in the national targets vis-à-vis the global targets;

(f) Concern about the uncertainty of available resources for the targets if ambition is set high;

(g) Setting new national targets for those targets not traditionally addressed by the biodiversity community, such as Targets 15 and 22;

(h) Considering section C of the Framework when setting national targets and breaking the global targets into elements which can be addressed in developing the national targets.

#### **D. Development of a national monitoring plan for the national biodiversity strategy and action plan**

19. The development of a national monitoring plan for the national biodiversity strategy and action plan was identified as a key area where further capacity-building and development is needed. In particular, this is needed for establishing or strengthening national monitoring systems, the development of indicators and use of indicators to track progress, and inform and enhance action. However, most of the countries participating in the dialogues had not yet begun the development of a national monitoring plan. To this end, participants from many countries noted that they could take a step-by-step approach, including developing targets first and then identifying associated indicators using the headline, component and complementary indicators in the monitoring framework, as well as national indicators. This could then be used as a starting point for identifying monitoring needs and strengthening monitoring systems. Other participants developed the national monitoring plan at the same time as the development of the national biodiversity strategy and action plan in order to already make use of existing data, information and knowledge.

20. Participants recognized the importance of developing a national monitoring plan in order to track implementation and evaluate progress (i.e. you cannot implement what you cannot measure).

21. Each dialogue identified opportunities to improve monitoring through long-term effort, investments in monitoring and utilizing different types of data streams, including citizen science, traditional knowledge, community monitoring, remote sensing and other existing monitoring initiatives by national research institutions and partners. The countries that participated in the dialogues were at different stages in terms of developing their national monitoring system. Some participants suggested developing a national biodiversity monitoring system as part of the national environmental monitoring system. Some countries noted the importance of developing an information or data management system as part of the monitoring system. There were challenges noted in terms of access to data held by different government departments and institutions, as well as by different international and regional organizations and institutions, and for capacity-building and development, in particular on the headline and other indicators contained in the global monitoring framework, difficulty in using or sharing data provided by different departments or institutions due to incompatibility of data formats, and lack of long-term investment in monitoring and the need for transboundary cooperation in monitoring the ecosystems or species shared by several countries.

#### **E. Capacity-building and development and biodiversity finance**

22. Each of the dialogues underlined the importance of developing a national capacity-building and development plan and a national biodiversity finance plan for the implementation of the national biodiversity strategy and action plan and the Framework.

23. The dialogues fostered discussion on good practices in capacity-building and development planning, including stakeholder analysis, assessment of capacity needs and the identification of specific actions to address them and the development of a strategy for mobilizing the resources needed to deliver capacity support. Challenges identified included a lack of political support and commitment, inadequate training activities, loss of expertise and capacity resulting from personnel change and high staff turnover, limited institutional capacities, competition for the limited available resources and limitations of delivering support to remote communities.

24. Good practices in biodiversity finance included identifying financial gaps and needs, reviewing policies and institutions and biodiversity expenditures and identifying and implementing financing solutions, while noting the need to adapt these methodologies to national circumstances while using methodologies, such as those provided by the Biodiversity and Finance Initiative (BIOFIN). Other good practices included raising the political support in order to increase investments in biodiversity and the need to establish effective mechanisms or policies to increase financial flows to biodiversity. Challenges were noted in terms of the current financial support available and the timely access to support for the implementation of the national biodiversity strategy and action plan, and limited capacity to undertake financing needs assessments or cost actions in the national biodiversity strategy and action plan and identify and implement innovative financing solutions.

## Annex

### List of dialogues on national biodiversity strategies and action plans

<i>Dialogue</i>	<i>Date and location</i>	<i>Partners</i>
Subregional dialogue on national biodiversity strategies and action plans for States members of the Association of Southeast Asian Nations and Timor-Leste	14–17 August 2023 Manila	Government of the Philippines, ASEAN Centre for Biodiversity, Deutsche Gesellschaft für Internationale Zusammenarbeit
Regional dialogue on national biodiversity strategies and action plans for countries in the Middle East and North Africa	16–19 January 2024 Amman	Government of Jordan, United Nations Development Programme country office
Regional dialogue on national biodiversity strategies and action plans for South and East Asia	23–26 January 2024 Tokyo	Government of Japan, United Nations University
Subregional dialogue on national biodiversity strategies and action plans for the Pacific countries	18–21 March 2024 Nadi, Fiji	Government of Fiji, Secretariat of the Pacific Regional Environment Programme, Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations
Subregional dialogue on national biodiversity strategies and action plans for Caribbean countries	15–17 April 2024 Georgetown	Government of Guyana, Secretariat of the Caribbean Community, Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations
Regional dialogue on national biodiversity strategies and action plans for anglophone African countries	30 May–2 June 2024 Nairobi	Government of Kenya, Institute of Sustainable Development of Francophonie, United Nations Environment Programme
Regional dialogue on national biodiversity strategies and action plans for francophone African countries	30 May–2 June 2024 Nairobi	Government of Kenya, Institute of Sustainable Development of Francophonie, United Nations Environment Programme
Regional dialogue on national biodiversity strategies and action plans for Latin America	25–28 June 2024 Lima	Government of Peru, United Nations Development Programme
Dialogue in Oman on national biodiversity strategies and action plans	22–25 July 2024 Salalah, Oman	Government of Oman, Cooperation Council for the Arab States of the Gulf
Dialogue in Tajikistan on national biodiversity strategies and actions	30 July–1 August 2024, Dushanbe	Government of Tajikistan, Deutsche Gesellschaft für Internationale Zusammenarbeit in Tajikistan
Dialogue on national biodiversity strategies and action plans organized with the European Union	28–29 August 2024 Brussels	European Union
Dialogue in the Republic of Moldova on national biodiversity strategies and action plans	9–11 September 2024 Chisinau	Government of the Republic of Moldova