



# Convention on Biological Diversity

Distr.: General  
20 April 2024

English only

---

## Subsidiary Body on Implementation

### Fourth meeting

Nairobi, 21–29 May 2024

Item 2 of the provisional agenda\*\*

### Review of implementation progress in national target setting and the updating of national biodiversity strategies and action plans

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

---

\* Reissued for technical reasons on 22 May 2024.

\*\* CBD/SBI/4/1.

\*\*\* The present document 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 these decisions, since August 2023, the Secretariat has been organizing 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 modus operandi of the open-ended forum for the voluntary country review of implementation under the Subsidiary Body on Implementation, requested in decision 15/6 and described in CBD/SBI/4/4/Add.1.<sup>1</sup>

5. Four dialogues were conducted between August 2023 and March 2024 with additional dialogues planned during 2024 (see annex). At the end of each dialogue, participants agreed on a summary of key points or conclusions that emerged from the discussions including common challenges, lessons learned, best practices and opportunities. The reports from these dialogues are available on the meetings webpage for each dialogue.<sup>2</sup> The present document contains an overview of the content and format of the dialogues (section II) and a summary of the findings from these dialogues (Section III).

## II. 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 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;

---

<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 and Denmark and from the European Union, in collaboration with various organizations and partners, including the Association of Southeast Asian Nations Centre for Biodiversity, the Secretariat of the Caribbean Community, and the Secretariat of the Pacific Regional Environment Programme, and support from countries hosting the dialogues, including Fiji, Guyana, Japan, Jordan and the Philippines. Technical support has been provided United Nations organizations, including the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations, the United Nations Environment Programme, the United Nations Development Programme and the United Nations University.

<sup>2</sup> See: [www.cbd.int/meetings/NBSAP-OM-2023-01](http://www.cbd.int/meetings/NBSAP-OM-2023-01) and [www.cbd.int/meetings/NBSAP-OM-2024-01](http://www.cbd.int/meetings/NBSAP-OM-2024-01)

- (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 of the issues and challenges for the overall revision or updating of national biodiversity strategies 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: 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 of the region 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 give consideration to the full range of relevant national stakeholders, including the national focal points of the Cartagena and Nagoya Protocols. Additionally, at each dialogue representatives from major stakeholder groups were invited, including from indigenous peoples and local communities, women and youth. The Secretariat also identified and invited other stakeholders relevant at the regional or sub-regional level.

### **III. Summary of key findings from regional and subregional dialogues on national biodiversity strategies and action plans held before 31 March 2024**

8. During each dialogue, participants from each country gave a presentation to share lessons learned and experiences on one of the topics described below. Additionally, participants provided an update of the current status of the process for revising/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.

9. 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; difficulties in collaboration due to project funds not being transferred to the ministries or agencies leading the work on updating or revising national biodiversity strategy and action plans.

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

10. 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.

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

(a) A stakeholder mapping can be 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;

(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 policy makers, customized engagement approaches to be employed with different stakeholder groups and sectors, and raising awareness or commitments through various activities;

(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 of 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;

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

(a) The time needed to engage stakeholders meaningfully while trying 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) A lack of interest, support, commitment and action from stakeholders, in some instances related to “consultation fatigue” due to many international, regional and national processes ongoing in parallel;

(d) A lack of political and financial support in engaging stakeholders;

(e) Capacity for strategic communication, particularly with sectoral actors not sympathetic to biodiversity issues.

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

13. 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. 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.

14. A number of challenges in achieving integration were noted, including the following:

(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 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.

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

15. 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 plan. A few good practices noted in the dialogues<sup>3</sup>, included the following:

(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 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;

16. Challenges in establishing the national biodiversity strategy and action plan process included the following:

(a) Lack of political support or commitment, lack of funding or delays in the provision of funds, and inadequate awareness of relevant stakeholders of the Kunming-Montreal Global Biodiversity Framework;

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

(c) Lack of availability of data or assessments, including 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. 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;

---

<sup>3</sup> The report of each dialogue is available online from [www.cbd.int/nbsap](http://www.cbd.int/nbsap).

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

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

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

17. 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 the establishing or strengthening of national monitoring systems, the development of indicators and use of indicators to track progress and inform 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 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.

18. Each dialogue identified opportunities to improve monitoring through long-term effort, investments in monitoring and utilizing different types data streams, including citizen science, traditional knowledge, community monitoring, remote sensing and other existing monitoring initiatives by national research institutions and partners. 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.

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

19. 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.

20. 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 due to personnel change and high staff turnover, limited institutional capacities, competition for the limited available resources and limitations of delivering support to remote communities.

21. Good practices in biodiversity finance included identifying financial gaps and needs, biodiversity expenditures and financing solutions, while noting the need to adapt these methodologies to national circumstances and using existing methodologies, such as 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.

#### **F. Conclusion**

22. Representatives of each country that participated in the dialogue prepared a national presentation, shared experiences in revising or updating their national biodiversity strategy and action plan and contributed to the discussion on challenges and opportunities. They 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 and involving a small number of countries which allowed for open discussion and information sharing.

Additionally, in each of the dialogues, participants expressed an interest in improving networks and sharing of experiences with other countries in order to enhance national implementation.

23. Informal regional or subregional dialogues could provide a mechanism for facilitating country review during the implementation of the Framework. The mutual learning and peer exchange in these dialogues can be an important source of support for Parties in their implementation efforts. The results of such dialogues could then be used to highlight common needs and good practices which could be shared more broadly, and responded to as appropriate, through the open-ended forum for voluntary country review at the Subsidiary Body on Implementation.

## Annex

### List of regional or subregional dialogues on national biodiversity strategies and action plans

| <b>Dialogue</b>   | <b>Date and location</b>       | <b>List of invited countries</b>  | <b>Partners</b>  |
|---|--------------------------------|---|--|
| <u>Dialogue on national biodiversity strategies and action plans for States members of the Association of Southeast Asian Nations and Timor-Leste</u> | 14–17 August 2023<br>Manila    | Brunei Darussalam, Cambodia, Indonesia, Lao People’s Democratic Republic, Malaysia, Myanmar, Philippines, Singapore, Thailand, Timor-Leste, and Viet Nam  | ASEAN Centre for Biodiversity, Deutsche Gesellschaft für Internationale Zusammenarbeit   |
| <u>Dialogue on national biodiversity strategies and action plans for countries in the Middle East and North Africa</u>                                | 16–19 January 2024<br>Amman    | Algeria, Egypt, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Jordan, Lebanon, Libya, Mauritania, Morocco, State of Palestine, Sudan, Syrian Arab Republic, Tunisia, and Yemen  | Ministry of Environment of Jordan, United Nations Development Programme country office   |
| <u>Dialogue on national biodiversity strategies and action plans for South and East Asia</u>  | 23–26 January 2024<br>Tokyo    | Afghanistan, Bangladesh, Bhutan, China, Democratic People’s Republic of Korea, India, Japan, Maldives, Mongolia, Nepal, Pakistan, Republic of Korea, and Sri Lanka  | Ministry of the Environment of Japan, United Nations University  |
| <u>Dialogue on national biodiversity strategies and action plans for countries in the Pacific region</u>  | 18–21 March 2024<br>Nadi, Fiji | Cook Islands, Fiji, Kiribati, Marshall Islands, Micronesia (Federated States of), Nauru, Niue, Palau, Papua New Guinea, Samoa, Solomon Islands, Tonga, Tuvalu, and Vanuatu  | Government of Fiji, Secretariat of the Pacific Regional Environment Programme, Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations |
| <u>Dialogue on national biodiversity strategies and action plans for Caribbean countries</u>  | 15–17 April 2024<br>Georgetown | Antigua and Barbuda, Bahamas, Barbados, Belize, Cuba, Dominica, Dominican Republic, Grenada, Guyana, Haiti, Jamaica, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, and Trinidad and Tobago  | Secretariat of the Caribbean Community, Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations  |
| <u>Dialogues on national biodiversity strategies and action plans for anglophone African countries</u>  | 30 May–2 June 2024<br>Nairobi  | Angola, Benin, Botswana, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cameroon, Cape Verde, the Central African Republic, Chad, Comoros, Congo, Côte d’Ivoire, the Democratic Republic of the Congo, Djibouti, Equatorial Guinea, Eritrea, Eswatini, Ethiopia, Gabon, Gambia, Ghana, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Kenya, Lesotho, Liberia, Madagascar, Malawi, Mali, Mauritius, | Institute of Sustainable Development of Francophonie, United Nations Environment Programme   |
| <u>Dialogue on national biodiversity strategies and action plans for francophone African countries</u>  |                                |   |  |



|  |                                  |  |  |
|--|----------------------------------|--|--|
|  |                                  | Mozambique, Namibia, Niger, Nigeria, Rwanda, Sao Tome and Principe, Senegal, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, Somalia, South Africa, South Sudan, Togo, Uganda, United Republic of Tanzania, Zambia, and Zimbabwe   |  |
| Dialogue in English for countries of Central and Eastern Europe                  | 24–26 June 2024<br>Georgia       | Albania, Armenia, Azerbaijan, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Bulgaria, Croatia, Czechia, Estonia, Georgia, Hungary, Latvia, Lithuania, Montenegro, North Macedonia, Poland, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Serbia, Slovakia, Slovenia, and Ukraine   | United Nations Environment Programme                                       |
| Dialogue in Russian for countries of Central Asia and Central and Eastern Europe | (Tbc<br>Kazakhstan)              | Belarus, Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, Russian Federation, Tajikistan, Turkmenistan, and Uzbekistan  | Regional Environmental Centre for Central Asia (CAREC), tbc                |
| Dialogue on national biodiversity strategies and action plans for Latin America  | 25–28 June 2024<br>Lima          | Argentina, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Brazil, Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, Ecuador, El Salvador, Guatemala, Honduras, Mexico, Nicaragua, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Uruguay, and Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of)  | Ministry of Environment of Peru, United Nations Development Programme Peru |
| Dialogue for Gulf Cooperation Council countries                                  | 22–23 July 2024<br>(Tbc)<br>Oman | Bahrain, Kuwait, Oman, Qatar, Saudi Arabia, and United Arab Emirates   | Government of the Sultanate of Oman, Gulf Cooperation Council              |
| Dialogue for Western European countries and other countries                      | Tbc<br>Tbc                       | Andorra, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Canada, Cyprus, Denmark, European Union, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Liechtenstein, Luxembourg, Malta, Monaco, Netherlands (Kingdom of the), New Zealand, Norway, Portugal, San Marino, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, Türkiye, and United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland | European Union, tbc  |