

Convention on Biological Diversity

Distr.
GENERAL

CBD/SBI/3/2/Add.1
25 March 2020

ORIGINAL: ENGLISH

SUBSIDIARY BODY ON IMPLEMENTATION

Third meeting

Montreal, Canada, 24-29 August 2020

Item 3 of the provisional agenda*

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

Note by the Executive Secretary

I. INTRODUCTION

1. National biodiversity strategies and action plans (NBSAPs) are the principal planning tool for the implementation of the Convention at the national level. Article 6 of the Convention on Biological Diversity states that each Contracting Party “shall, in accordance with its particular conditions and capabilities, develop national strategies, plans or programmes for the conservation and sustainable use of biological diversity or adapt for this purpose existing strategies, plans or programmes which shall reflect, inter alia, the measures set out in the Convention relevant to the Contracting Party concerned”. Almost all Parties (97%) have developed at least one NBSAP since they became a Party.

2. In decision X/2, the Conference of the Parties urged Parties to review, revise and update, as appropriate, their NBSAPs in line with the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020. Aichi Biodiversity Target 17, which had a deadline of 2015, called on Parties to develop, adopt as a policy instrument and commence implementing an effective, participatory and updated NBSAP. Parties also committed to establishing national targets, using the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020 and its Aichi Biodiversity Targets as a flexible framework.

3. The present note is updated from a note submitted to the Conference of the Parties at its fourteenth meeting (CBD/COP/14/5/Add.1) to reflect further national-level activities carried out since the earlier document was prepared, according to information provided by countries and using those NBSAPs that were received by the Secretariat in an official language of the United Nations by 16 March 2020.

4. Progress in the development or revision/updating of NBSAPs is summarized in section II. A summary of progress in establishing national targets, including in relation to achieving the Aichi Biodiversity Targets, is provided in section III. An analysis of the contents of the NBSAPs submitted since the adoption of the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020 is provided in section IV. Related information is also provided in the document on progress in the implementation of the Convention and the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020 and towards the achievement of the Aichi Biodiversity Targets (CBD/SBI/3/2), and in the document on mechanisms to facilitate review of implementation (CBD/SBI/3/11).

* CBD/SBI/3/1.

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

5. Since 1993, 191 Parties (97%) have developed at least one NBSAP, while 5 Parties have yet to submit their first NBSAP. As of 16 March 2020, of the 191 Parties that have prepared NBSAPs, 154 have revised them at least once.

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

7. By the December 2015 deadline established in Aichi Biodiversity Target 17, only 69 Parties had submitted an NBSAP prepared or revised/updated after the adoption of the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020. As of 16 March 2020, 101 additional countries have submitted an NBSAP, bringing the total to 170.¹ Of this total, 149 Parties submitted revised NBSAPs.^{2,3} While they are submitted in various forms, all submissions are considered NBSAPs for the purposes of this document.

8. The current status of NBSAP preparation and revision/updating, as reported informally to the Secretariat, is as follows:

¹ Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Andorra, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Australia (revised its NBSAP in the light of the preliminary framework of the Strategic Plan but considers it to be in line with the final Strategy adopted at the tenth meeting of the Conference of the Parties), Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Belarus, Belgium, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cabo Verde, Cambodia, Cameroon, Canada, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cuba, Czechia, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominica, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Eritrea, Estonia, Eswatini, Ethiopia, European Union, Finland, France, Gambia, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Honduras, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kiribati, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Latvia, Lebanon, Liberia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Micronesia (Federated States of), Mongolia, Montenegro, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nauru, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Niue, North Macedonia, Norway, Pakistan, Palau, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Russian Federation, Rwanda, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Samoa, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, San Marino, Sao Tome and Principe, Senegal, Serbia, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Solomon Islands, Somalia, South Africa, South Sudan, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Sweden, Switzerland, Tajikistan, Thailand, Timor-Leste, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Turkmenistan, Tuvalu, Uganda, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Vanuatu, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, and Zimbabwe.

² Among these, 2 Parties completed their revisions prior to the tenth meeting of the Conference of the Parties, albeit with consideration given to the draft Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020. In addition, 2 Parties submitted both their first NBSAP and a revised version, 3 Parties submitted two revised versions, 1 Party submitted a revised NBSAP constituted by actions for implementing the Aichi Biodiversity Targets that have been integrated into several policy plans, 1 Party submitted a revised NBSAP constituted by its 2020 biodiversity goals and targets mapped to the Aichi Biodiversity Targets and a biodiversity outcomes framework prepared before the tenth meeting of the Conference of the Parties, and 1 Party submitted a revised NBSAP which was prepared prior to the tenth meeting of the Conference of the Parties.

³ As for the remaining 21 Parties, 16 Parties submitted their first NBSAPs, 1 Party submitted a 2020 Action Plan for enhancing implementation of its Strategy adopted before the tenth meeting of the Conference of the Parties, 1 Party submitted a 2028 Action Plan as an addendum to its NBSAP prepared before the tenth meeting of the Conference of the Parties which remains current, 2 Parties submitted addendums to their NBSAPs prepared before the tenth meeting of the Conference of the Parties constituted by national targets and actions for achieving the Aichi Biodiversity Targets, and 1 Party submitted its first NBSAP developed prior to the tenth meeting of the Conference of the Parties.

Table 1. NBSAP preparation and revision/updating status as of 16 March 2020

NBSAPs submitted to the Secretariat	170
NBSAPs under preparation or revision, or completed and pending final approval	20
No plans to update NBSAP in the near future	1
No information	5
Total	196

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

9. In decision X/2, the Conference of the Parties urged Parties and other Governments to develop national and regional targets, using the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020 and its Aichi Biodiversity Targets as a flexible framework, in accordance with national priorities and capacities, the status and trends of biological diversity in the country, and resources provided through the strategy for resource mobilization, while also bearing in mind national contributions to the achievement of the global targets, and to report progress to the Conference of the Parties at its eleventh meeting. Very few Parties were able to meet this deadline. However, as of 16 March 2020, 169 Parties have submitted national targets.

10. The Secretariat has compiled a database of all “targets”⁴ presented in NBSAPs, fifth national reports or separate documents submitted since the tenth meeting of the Conference of the Parties. As of 16 March 2020, the database contains 4,107 separate “targets”. Wherever national targets have been mapped to the global targets by the Party concerned, this is represented in the database. To date, 99 Parties⁵ have done so. Further analysis of national targets is provided in the updated analysis of the contribution of targets established by Parties and progress towards the Aichi Biodiversity Targets (CBD/SBI/3/2/Add.2).

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

11. This section presents an update of key findings from an internal analysis of the 167 NBSAPs received in one of the official languages of the United Nations since the adoption of the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity until 16 March 2020.⁶ The criteria for this analysis are based on the NBSAP guidance adopted in [decision IX/8](#). It includes the following categories: (a) basic information; (b) revision process; (c) components of the NBSAP; and (d) mainstreaming. The information in the analysis is taken from the contents of the NBSAPs, unless otherwise indicated. A limited number of examples are provided to illustrate the criteria for this analysis.

⁴ For the full set, see <https://www.cbd.int/nbsap/targets/default.shtml>. Note that the definition and use of the term “target” is quite varied among Parties. In the database, all “achievable” measures in an NBSAP have been included as “targets”, even if the NBSAP itself uses a different term, such as “objective”, “action” or “work area”.

⁵ Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Andorra, Antigua and Barbuda, Bahrain, Belarus, Belgium, Belize, Bhutan, Botswana, Brazil, Cabo Verde, Cambodia, Cameroon, Canada, Chile, China, Comoros, Côte d’Ivoire, Croatia, Cuba, Czechia, Denmark, Ecuador, Egypt, Eswatini, Ethiopia, France, Gambia, Georgia, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, Honduras, India, Indonesia, Iraq, Ireland, Jamaica, Japan, Kiribati, Lao People’s Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Liberia, Luxembourg, Malawi, Mauritius, Mexico, Micronesia (Federated States of), Mongolia, Morocco, Myanmar, Namibia, New Zealand, Niger, Nigeria, North Macedonia, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Peru, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Russian Federation, Rwanda, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, Solomon Islands, South Africa, South Sudan, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Sweden, Switzerland, North Macedonia, Timor-Leste, Togo, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukraine, United Kingdom, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Viet Nam, Yemen, and Zimbabwe.

⁶ The analysis is based on the information contained in the NBSAPs and comments received since the earlier version (CBD/COP/14/5/Add.1) was prepared for the fourteenth meeting of the Conference of the Parties. Of the 170 Parties listed in footnote 1 above, three Parties (Angola, Latvia, and Portugal) have not provided a version in an official language of the United Nations and are therefore not included in the analysis.

A. Basic information

12. As stated in section II, NBSAPs have been submitted to the Secretariat in various forms. However, for the purpose of this analysis, all of these documents are considered NBSAPs and the Secretariat refers to them as such. While 142 of the documents reviewed⁷ are national biodiversity strategies and action plans (NBSAPs), *or* solely action plans, 22 are strategy or policy documents.⁸ Five of the Parties⁹ that have submitted these strategy documents intend to develop action plans. In addition, three Parties¹⁰ submitted addendums to strategies or action plans prepared prior to the tenth meeting of the Conference of the Parties, comprised of national targets and actions for achieving the Aichi Biodiversity Targets.

13. The timelines of the NBSAPs submitted to date also vary. While 7 NBSAPs¹¹ cover periods between 2015 and 2018, 82 cover periods up to 2020¹² and 64 others cover periods up to 2030.¹³ Fourteen NBSAPs do not specify a timeline.¹⁴

⁷ Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Andorra, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brazil, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cabo Verde, Cambodia, Cameroon, Chad, Chile, China, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cuba, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Djibouti, Dominica, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, Equatorial Guinea, Eritrea, Estonia, Eswatini, Ethiopia, European Union, Finland, Gambia, Guinea-Bissau, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guatemala, Guyana, Honduras, Indonesia, Ireland, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kiribati, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Liberia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritius, Mexico, Micronesia (Federated States of), Mongolia, Montenegro, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Nicaragua, Namibia, Nauru, Nepal, New Zealand, Niger, Nigeria, Niue, North Macedonia, Norway, Pakistan, Palau, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Russian Federation, Rwanda, Qatar, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, San Marino, Sao Tome and Principe, Senegal, Serbia, Seychelles, Solomon Islands, Somalia, South Africa, South Sudan, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Switzerland, Tajikistan, Thailand, Timor-Leste, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Turkmenistan, Tuvalu, Uganda, Ukraine, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Vanuatu, Yemen, Zambia, and Zimbabwe.

⁸ Azerbaijan, Belarus, Belgium, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Brunei Darussalam, Czechia, Colombia, Denmark, El Salvador, France, Guinea, Hungary, Kyrgyzstan, Mauritania, Netherlands, Sierra Leone, Slovakia, Sweden, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), and Viet Nam.

⁹ Belarus, Colombia, El Salvador, Slovakia, and Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of).

¹⁰ Canada, India, and Singapore.

¹¹ Afghanistan (2014-2017), Burkina Faso (Action Plan 2015), Peru (2018), Serbia (2018), Spain (2017), Suriname (2016), and Tuvalu (2016).

¹² Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Austria, Azerbaijan, Belarus, Belize, Belgium, Benin, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Burundi, Cambodia, Cameroon, Canada, Chad, Comoros, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Djibouti, Dominica, Dominican Republic, Eritrea, Estonia, Ethiopia, European Union, Finland, France, Gambia, Georgia, Germany, Grenada, Guyana, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Kyrgyzstan, India, Indonesia, Iraq, Italy, Japan, Jordan, Kiribati, Kuwait, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Montenegro, Morocco, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Paraguay, Poland, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Russian Federation, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, Sao Tome and Principe, Senegal, Seychelles, Singapore, Slovakia, Solomon Islands, Sudan, Sweden, Switzerland, Tajikistan, Timor-Leste, Togo, United Kingdom, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam, and Zimbabwe.

¹³ Algeria (2030), Andorra (2024), Australia (2030), Bahrain (2021), Bangladesh (2021), Bolivia (2030), Botswana (2025), Brunei Darussalam (2035), Cabo Verde (2030), Chile (2030), China (2030), Congo (2030), Costa Rica (2025), Croatia (2025), Czechia (2025), Honduras (2022), Ecuador (2030), Egypt (2030), Eswatini (2022), Ghana (2040), Greece (2029), Guatemala (2022), Guinea (2025), Iran (Islamic Republic of) (2030), Ireland (2021), Jamaica (2021), Kyrgyzstan (2024), Lao People's Democratic Republic (2025), Lebanon (2030), Liberia (2025), Luxembourg (2021), Madagascar (2025), Malawi (2025), Malaysia (2025), Maldives (2025), Mauritius (2025), Mexico (2030), Micronesia (Federated States of) (2023), Mongolia (2025), Mozambique (2035), Namibia (2022), North Macedonia (2023), Pakistan (2030), Palau (2025), Philippines (2028), Qatar (2025), Republic of Korea (2023), San Marino (2025), Senegal (2030), Sierra Leone (2026), Somalia (2030), South Africa (2025), South Sudan (2027), Sri Lanka (2022), Thailand (2021), Trinidad and Tobago (2022), Tunisia (2030), Turkey (2028), Turkmenistan (2023), Uganda (2025), United Arab Emirates (2021), Vanuatu (2030), Yemen (2025), and Zambia (2025).

¹⁴ Albania, Armenia, Brazil, Colombia, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Denmark, Equatorial Guinea, Bhutan, El Salvador, Myanmar, Nauru, Norway, Niue, and Rwanda.

Adoption as policy instrument

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

15. The actual implications of adoption as a policy instrument vary from country to country and by the level at which the NBSAP is adopted and it is difficult to know if, and to what extent, adoption as a policy instrument has indeed resulted in mainstreaming of biodiversity in sectoral and cross-sectoral policy and practice. The Secretariat observes that Parties have responded to this component of Aichi Biodiversity Target 17 by having their NBSAPs adopted by a variety of authorities, including royalty, cabinets and councils of ministers. Other Parties have kept this adoption strictly in the realm of the environmental sector. Some examples follow.¹⁵

16. A total of 69 NBSAPs¹⁶ have been adopted as “whole-of-government” instruments. For example:

(a) The NBSAPs of Cambodia, Croatia, India, Georgia, Germany, Guyana, Hungary, Japan, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Norway, Republic of Korea, Seychelles, Sri Lanka, Thailand, Tuvalu, Ukraine and Zimbabwe were adopted/endorsed by their Cabinets or an equivalent body;

(b) The Councils of Ministers of Belarus, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Benin, Chile, Greece, Lebanon, Luxembourg, Mauritania, Poland, Sudan and Switzerland approved their NBSAP;

(c) The NBSAPs of Azerbaijan, Cambodia, France, Palau and Spain were approved by their Heads of Government;

(d) The NBSAP of Costa Rica is part of the National Biodiversity Policy (2015-2030) (PNB) adopted by decree. Similarly, the NBSAP of Panama was adopted by decree in 2018, following consideration given to the Aichi Biodiversity Targets and the Sustainable Development Goals, as well as to the National Biodiversity Policy adopted by decree in 2008. Albania also adopted its NBSAP by decree in 2016;

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

(f) The NBSAP of Sweden was adopted by the Parliament;

(g) The NBSAP of China was adopted by the State Council.

17. A total of 18 other countries¹⁷ have stated their intent to have their NBSAP adopted as a policy instrument.

18. Eight other NBSAPs¹⁸ have been adopted as instruments applying to the environmental sector. For example: The Biodiversity Conservation Strategy of Australia was adopted by the Government and functions as a policy “umbrella” over other more specific national environmental frameworks. It is also a

¹⁵ Information on the status of NBSAP adoption takes into consideration information received from Parties since the fourteenth meeting of the Conference of the Parties, in response to email inquiries from the Secretariat (decision 14/1, para. 22), as well as in response to notification 2020-019 dated 14 February 2020 through which CBD national focal points, Cartagena Protocol focal points, ABS focal points, SBSTTA focal points, and indigenous peoples and local communities and relevant organizations were advised that the draft version of this document would be available on the Convention’s website for peer review until 6 March 2020.

¹⁶ Albania, Andorra, Argentina, Armenia, Azerbaijan, Belarus, Belize, Benin, Bolivia, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Cambodia, Chile, China, Colombia, Costa Rica, Côte d’Ivoire, Croatia, Denmark, Estonia, European Union, Finland, France, Georgia, Germany, Greece, Grenada, Guyana, Hungary, India, Japan, Kyrgyzstan, Lebanon, Liberia, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malta, Mongolia, Morocco, Myanmar, Namibia, Nauru, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, North Macedonia, Norway, Pakistan, Palau, Panama, Philippines, Poland, Peru, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Rwanda, Serbia, Seychelles, Singapore, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Sweden, Switzerland, Thailand, Trinidad and Tobago, Turkey, Tuvalu, Ukraine, and Zimbabwe.


¹⁷ Afghanistan, Antigua and Barbuda, Burundi, Eswatini, Guinea, Jordan, Kiribati (in process), Lebanon, Mauritania, Mauritius, Pakistan, Philippines, Romania, Samoa, Solomon Islands, South Sudan, Uganda, and Vanuatu.

¹⁸ Australia, Bhutan, Dominican Republic, Ethiopia, Guatemala, Lithuania, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, and Tajikistan.

guiding policy framework for the diverse mix of Australian, state, territory and local government and private sector approaches to biodiversity conservation.

19. The remaining 72 NBSAPs do not provide sufficient information to know if they have been adopted as a policy instrument or, if they have been, what type of instrument they are. A graphic overview of NBSAP adoption as a policy instrument is presented in figure 1.

Figure 1. NBSAP adoption as policy instrument



20. The percentage of Parties that informed the Secretariat about the adoption of their NBSAPs as “whole-of-government” instruments varied with the source of funding. While over 50 per cent of Parties that are not eligible for financial support from the Global Environment Facility have adopted their NBSAP as a policy instrument applying to all of government, only 36 per cent of the Parties that worked with the United Nations Development Programme and 22 per cent of the Parties working with the United Nations Environment Programme as an implementing agency have done so. A total of 33 per cent of Parties accessing GEF funds through the direct access modality have adopted their NBSAPs as whole of government instruments. Even if all Parties that indicated their intent to adopt their NBSAP as a policy instrument did so as an all-of-government policy instrument, those not receiving GEF funding would have a significantly higher rate of adoption. However, more than half of the NBSAPs (52 per cent) did not allow conclusions regarding their status as a policy instrument. Table 2 provides this information by funding source.

Table 2. Adoption of NBSAPs as policy instruments, by funding source

Implementing agency	Types of instruments			
	Instrument applying to all Gvt.	Instrument applying to Environment	Plans to have NBSAP adopted	Insufficient evidence
UNEP	15 (22%)	3 (4%)	12 (17%)	40 (57%)
UNDP	16 (36%)	1 (2%)	3 (7%)	24 (55%)
FAO	0	0	0	1 (100%)
Direct access	2 (33%)	0	1 (17%)	3 (50%)

No info. on agency/did not apply for GEF funds	1 (50%)	0	0	1 (50%)
Not GEF-eligible	22 (54%)	2 (5%)	1 (2%)	16 (39%)
TOTAL	56 (34%)	6 (4%)	17 (10%)	85 (52%)

B. Revision process

1. Assessment of previous NBSAPs

21. Of the Parties that have submitted a post-2010 NBSAP, 111¹⁹ mention having done an assessment²⁰ of their previous NBSAP as part of, or contributing to, the revision process. These assessments have helped Parties to understand the strengths and shortcomings of their previous NBSAPs in order to build and improve on these in the latest revision. The specific subjects covered in these assessments vary. Very few reflect on the quality or usefulness of the NBSAP as a planning or implementation instrument. Generally, they have addressed the proportion of NBSAP activities that have been implemented, their achievements, and their implementation challenges. Some examples follow:

(a) The assessments of 19 Parties²¹ reported the percentage of accomplishment of the previous NBSAP's objectives, projects or activities. The percentages and degrees of accomplishment vary greatly from one country to another;

(b) The assessments of 46 Parties²² reported on specific achievements during the period of their previous NBSAP. Of these, the most commonly cited were forest rehabilitation (25 Parties), the development of new policies, legislation, and/or the improvement of institutional frameworks (24 Parties), the establishment of new conservation programmes (20 Parties), and increases in protected area coverage (17 Parties) or improvements in their management (14 Parties);

(c) The assessments of 60 Parties²³ reported on implementation challenges. The most commonly cited were insufficient financial resources (36 Parties), lack of/weak mainstreaming in national and sectoral policies (25 Parties), inadequate monitoring and evaluation frameworks (26 Parties), and lack of/weak communication with other departments/agencies (26 Parties).

¹⁹ Albania, Algeria, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Azerbaijan, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Belgium, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brazil, Burundi, Cabo Verde, Cambodia, Cameroon, Chad, Chile, Costa Rica, Croatia, Cuba, Czechia, China, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Dominica, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Djibouti, Ecuador, Egypt, Equatorial Guinea, Eswatini, Ethiopia, European Union, Finland, France, Gambia, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Grenada, Guinea, Honduras, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Ireland, Japan, Jordan, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Liberia, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Micronesia (Federated States of), Mongolia, Montenegro, Morocco, Mozambique, Namibia, Nepal, Nigeria, Niue, North Macedonia, Pakistan, Palau, Paraguay, Philippines, Poland, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Russian Federation, Rwanda, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, Sao Tome and Principe, Senegal, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, Slovakia, South Africa, Sri Lanka, Suriname, Tajikistan, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Viet Nam, Uganda, United Kingdom, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Vanuatu, Yemen, Zambia, and Zimbabwe.

²⁰ This includes assessments of implementation of relevance to the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020, among others.

²¹ Croatia, Dominica, Honduras, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Ireland, Jordan, Mongolia, Montenegro, Namibia, Poland, Republic of Korea, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Sierra Leone, South Africa, Sri Lanka, Tajikistan, Thailand, United Republic of Tanzania, and Viet Nam.

²² Albania, Algeria, Armenia, Australia, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Belize, Bhutan, Cabo Verde, Chad, Chile, China, Comoros, Ecuador, Egypt, Gambia, Georgia, Grenada, Guinea, Ireland, Kiribati, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Mauritius, Micronesia (Federated States of), Namibia, North Macedonia, Pakistan, Republic of Korea, Rwanda, Samoa, Sao Tome and Principe, Senegal, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, South Africa, Tajikistan, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, United Kingdom, and Uruguay.

²³ Algeria, Armenia, Australia, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Belize, Botswana, Cambodia, Cameroon, Czechia, Chile, China, Comoros, Croatia, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Djibouti, Egypt, Equatorial Guinea, Eswatini, Ethiopia, France, Gambia, Grenada, Guinea, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Indonesia, Jordan, Kiribati, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Liberia, Luxembourg, Maldives, Mauritius, Micronesia (Federated States of), Mozambique, Namibia, Nigeria, North Macedonia, Pakistan, Philippines, Poland, Republic of Korea, Russian Federation, Rwanda, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Samoa, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Sri Lanka, Tajikistan, Thailand, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Uganda, United Kingdom, United Republic of Tanzania, Yemen, Zambia, and Zimbabwe.

2. Stakeholder engagement

22. Most Parties reported the involvement of a range of stakeholders in the NBSAP revision process. However, few insights are provided on the quality of this involvement or the implications for the implementation of the NBSAP. The government ministries that were most commonly involved were: Agriculture, Fisheries, Development/Planning, Forestry, Tourism, Education, Finance, Trade and Industry and Infrastructure/Transport. Other ministries involved included: Culture, Science and Technology, Economy, Health, Sports and Social Affairs (see figure 2).

23. Parties also reported on the involvement of non-governmental stakeholders in the revision process. These include indigenous and local communities (reported in 40 NBSAPs²⁴), NGOs/civil society (100 NBSAPs²⁵), private sector (51 NBSAPs²⁶) and academia (70 NBSAPs²⁷).

24. Of the 167 NBSAPs reviewed, 97 record having a formal coordination structure, or a working group for NBSAP-related tasks, composed of different stakeholders.²⁸ The mandates of these coordination mechanisms vary. While, in some countries, their mandate is limited to revision of the NBSAP, in other countries, coordination mechanisms are also mandated to monitor implementation. In some, they are also mandated to oversee the implementation process itself (Bangladesh, China, Costa Rica, European Union, Finland, Indonesia, Ireland, Japan, Nigeria, Senegal South Africa, Timor-Leste and Yemen).

²⁴ Algeria, Argentina, Bolivia, Brazil, Burundi, Cameroon, Colombia, Costa Rica, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Ethiopia, Finland, Gambia, Ghana, Grenada, Guatemala, Guyana, Honduras, Indonesia, Japan, Malawi, Mexico, Micronesia (Federated States of), Namibia, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Solomon Islands, South Africa, Sri Lanka, Suriname, Thailand, Togo, Uganda, Vanuatu, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Yemen, and Zambia.


²⁵ Afghanistan, Algeria, Andorra, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Belarus, Belgium, Belize, Bhutan, Bolivia, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Brazil, Burundi, Cabo Verde, Cameroon, Chile, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Djibouti, Dominica, Dominican Republic, Equatorial Guinea, Eritrea, Estonia, Eswatini, Ethiopia, Finland, France, Gambia, Georgia, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, Honduras, Hungary, Indonesia, Iraq, Ireland, Jamaica, Japan, Kiribati, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Liberia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Malawi, Maldives, Mauritius, Mexico, Micronesia (Federated States of), Mongolia, Myanmar, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nauru, Nigeria, North Macedonia, Palau, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Rwanda, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Samoa, Senegal, Serbia, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, Solomon Islands, Somalia, South Africa, South Sudan, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Switzerland, Tajikistan, Thailand, Timor-Leste, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Uganda, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Vanuatu, Yemen, Zambia, and Zimbabwe.

²⁶ Algeria, Bahrain, Belize, Bolivia, Brazil, Cabo Verde, Cameroon, Chile, Colombia, Congo, Croatia, Dominica, Dominican Republic, Estonia, Eswatini, Finland, France, Gambia, Georgia, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, Iraq, Jamaica, Japan, Kiribati, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Malawi, Maldives, Mauritius, Mozambique, Namibia, North Macedonia, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Republic of Korea, Rwanda, Solomon Islands, Somalia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Switzerland, Thailand, Togo, Uganda, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, and Yemen.

²⁷ Afghanistan, Algeria, Argentina, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Belize, Bolivia, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Brazil, Cabo Verde, Cambodia, Chile, Colombia, Côte d'Ivoire, Dominican Republic, Equatorial Guinea, Eritrea, Estonia, Eswatini, Ethiopia, Finland, France, Gambia, Georgia, Ghana, Guatemala, Honduras, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Kyrgyzstan, Lebanon, Malawi, Mauritius, Mexico, Micronesia (Federated States of), Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nigeria, North Macedonia, Panama, Paraguay, Philippines, Samoa, Senegal, Serbia, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, Somalia, South Sudan, Spain, Sri Lanka, Switzerland, Tajikistan, Thailand, Timor-Leste, Togo, Uganda, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Yemen, Zambia, and Zimbabwe.

²⁸ Afghanistan, Algeria, Andorra, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Belarus, Belgium, Bhutan, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brazil, Burkina Faso (according to IUCN study), Cabo Verde, Cambodia, Cameroon, Chad, China, Czechia, Colombia (according to IUCN study), Congo, Costa Rica, Dominican Republic, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Egypt, Eritrea, Estonia, Eswatini, Ethiopia, European Union, France, Finland, Gambia, Georgia, Greece, Guatemala (according to IUCN study), Guinea, Guyana, Honduras, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Liberia, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Maldives, Mali, Mexico, Micronesia (Federated States of), Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nauru, Netherlands, Nepal, Nigeria, Niue, North Macedonia, Pakistan, Palau, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Republic of Korea, Romania, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, Senegal, Serbia, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, Somalia, South Africa, Sudan, Tajikistan, Timor-Leste, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Turkey, Uganda, United Republic of Tanzania, Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, and Zimbabwe.

Figure 2. Number of Parties reporting the involvement and roles of other ministries in NBSAP process



3. Clearing-house mechanism

25. Of the 167 Parties that have submitted a revised NBSAP, only 5 reported having used their national clearing-house mechanism in the NBSAP revision process.²⁹ A total of 36 Parties³⁰ have set actions and/or plans in their revised NBSAP to establish a national clearing-house mechanism.

26. Of those Parties that do have a clearing-house mechanism, 45 NBSAPs³¹ mention their intention to improve and enhance their current information management system.

²⁹ Belgium, European Union, France, Japan and Niger.

³⁰ Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Bangladesh, Belize, Bolivia, Costa Rica, Dominica, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Equatorial Guinea, Eswatini, Gambia, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Iraq, Jordan, Kiribati, Liberia, Malawi, Mongolia, Myanmar, Nauru, Nepal, Niue, North Macedonia, Peru, Republic of Korea, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, San Marino, Sierra Leone, South Africa, South Sudan, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Timor-Leste, United Arab Emirates and United Republic of Tanzania.

C. Components of the NBSAP

1. Resource mobilization strategies

27. In decision XI/14, paragraph 25, the Conference of the Parties encouraged Parties to “develop, as appropriate, country-specific resource mobilization strategies, including assessment of resource needs, as part of their updated national biodiversity strategies and action plans”. In this regard, 25 NBSAPs³² specifically contain a national resource mobilization strategy or equivalent.³³ Some examples are:

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

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

(c) The Resource Mobilization Plan of Costa Rica was created as a result of that country’s engagement in the [Biodiversity Finance Initiative \(BIOFIN\)](#);

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

(e) The Financing Strategy of Rwanda focuses on initiating innovative financial mechanisms in order to increase public and private budget contributions and development partners’ support.

28. A total of 64 revised NBSAPs³⁴ include a costing for their action plans. Only 12 of these (already mentioned above) also contain a completed resource mobilization strategy.

29. A total of 100 Parties³⁵ have set national targets in line with Aichi Biodiversity Target 20, and 81 explain, in their NBSAPs, efforts that have been put in place to increase financing for biodiversity in their countries and/or their intention to develop resource mobilization plans:

³¹ Albania, Algeria, Australia, Belgium, Burundi, Cambodia, Cameroon, Chad, China, Colombia, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Egypt, Ethiopia, European Union, Finland, Georgia, Germany, Guatemala, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Italy, Japan, Lao People’s Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mexico, Micronesia (Federated States of), Morocco, Mozambique, Norway, Philippines, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Samoa, Togo, United Kingdom, Yemen and Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of).

³² Belgium, Benin, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Burundi, Comoros, Costa Rica, Côte d’Ivoire, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Guinea, Guyana, Liberia, Malawi, Maldives, Mali, Mauritania, Micronesia (Federated States of), Morocco, Niger, Nigeria, Niue, Palau, Rwanda, Timor-Leste, and Yemen.

³³ Some Parties may have submitted resource mobilization strategies or components thereof, not in their NBSAP but in their financial reports to the Convention and/or in their fifth national reports or other documents. These are not considered in the present document.

³⁴ Albania, Algeria, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Benin, Bhutan, Botswana, Brunei Darussalam, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Chad, Costa Rica, Dominica, Egypt, Eritrea, Estonia, Eswatini, Finland, Ghana, Guatemala, Guinea-Bissau, Guinea, India, Jamaica, Kiribati, Kyrgyzstan, Lebanon, Liberia, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Maldives, Mali, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mozambique, Namibia, Nepal, Nicaragua, Niger, North Macedonia, Pakistan, Panama, Paraguay, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Rwanda (parts of), Philippines, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Senegal, Sao Tome and Principe, Sierra Leone, Somalia, South Sudan, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Spain, Togo, Tunisia, Uganda, Yemen and Zimbabwe.

(a) Belize funds its [National Protected Areas System](#) through a variety of funding mechanisms including grants from the [Protected Areas Conservation Trust \(PACT\)](#), Debt-for-Nature agreements, revenue generated directly from the protected areas themselves, and funds leveraged by protected area co-management agencies;

(b) The “[Okapi](#)” Trust Fund for the rehabilitation of protected areas in the Democratic Republic of the Congo was created in 2014 and endorsed under the Law for Nature Conservation;

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

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

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

(f) Trinidad and Tobago has the Green Fund which was established under the Finance Act in 2000 as the Green Fund Levy. The funds collected are meant to provide financial assistance to organizations and community groups for implementing activities related to remediation, reforestation of the environment and conservation;

(g) The Federated States of Micronesia has the [Micronesia Conservation Trust \(MCT\)](#), which began operating in 2002. It is the first conservation trust fund in the region, supporting biodiversity conservation, climate change adaptation and sustainable development throughout the Federated States of Micronesia and wider Micronesian region.

2. *Communication, education and public awareness*

30. Decisions [VIII/6](#) and [IX/8](#) state that communication, education and public awareness (CEPA) strategies and activities should be integral parts of NBSAPs. Of the 167 post-Nagoya NBSAPs, 38 NBSAPs³⁶ contain a CEPA strategy and action plan or equivalent and another 101 NBSAPs³⁷ contain initiatives relating to communication, education and public awareness. Some examples follow:

³⁵ Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Bangladesh, Cabo Verde, Belarus, Belgium, Benin, Bhutan, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brazil, Burundi, Cambodia, Cameroon, Chile, China, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Cuba, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Dominican Republic, Djibouti, Equatorial Guinea, Ecuador, Egypt, Eritrea, Eswatini, Ethiopia, European Union, Finland, Gambia, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guinea-Bissau, Guinea, Guyana, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Jordan, Jamaica, Japan, Kuwait, Luxembourg, Lao People’s Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Liberia, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Micronesia (Federated States of), Mongolia, Montenegro, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nigeria, Niue, North Macedonia, Palau, Pakistan, Panama, Republic of Korea, Rwanda, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Serbia, Samoa, Serbia, Sierra Leone, Solomon Islands, Somalia, South Sudan, Tajikistan, Thailand, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Turkmenistan, Uganda, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Vanuatu, Zambia, and Zimbabwe.

³⁶ Bangladesh, Belize, Benin, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Burundi, Comoros, Costa Rica, Côte d’Ivoire, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Eswatini, Finland, France, Ghana, Guatemala, Guyana, Lebanon, Liberia, Malawi, Maldives, Mauritania, Mexico, Micronesia (Federated States of), Namibia, Nepal, Niger, Nigeria, Niue, Palau, Panama, Philippines, Republic of Korea, Rwanda, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Senegal, Sudan, Trinidad and Tobago and Timor-Leste.

- (a) Ecuador has a National Plan for Citizen Environmental Education which contains projects aimed at promoting environmental practices. The Plan is also known as [“We are part of the solution”](#);
- (b) In Finland, continuing education for teachers (in species knowledge and pedagogy in biodiversity issues) will be developed, and, with the help of new information technology, species knowledge and sustainable development education will be promoted;
- (c) One of the short-term priorities of Nauru is to: [“systematically educate individuals through formal and informal courses on the knowledge of the country’s biodiversity and skills, both traditional and new, to sustainably manage these resources”](#);
- (d) New Zealand has a conservation education programme led by local children to [“bring biodiversity back to the town”](#). The country also has a programme called [“Healthy Nature Healthy People”](#), co-designed by Government agencies, NGOs and Maori to improve lives of New Zealanders through connection to nature;
- (e) Nicaragua is intending to integrate the themes of Mother Earth and biodiversity into university curricula. The country will also introduce the best thesis based on the Route to the Common Good (Ruta del Bien Común de la Madre Tierra) in youth forums in order to promote research on biodiversity;
- (f) Norway will continue its [Sustainable Backpack programme](#), a nationwide initiative by the [Ministry of Education and Research](#) and the [Ministry of Climate and Environment](#) to support Norwegian schools in implementing Education for Sustainable Development;
- (g) Saint Kitts and Nevis is planning to establish a biodiversity knowledge network within secondary schools using Edu NET, which is a network for facilitating communication, collaboration, e-Learning and research for secondary school students;
- (h) In December 2010, the Government of Sweden adopted the outdoor recreation policy’s overarching goals, established to support opportunities for people to spend time in nature and enjoy outdoor recreational activities;
- (i) Bolivia plans to develop and promote awareness-raising campaigns on the prevention of illegal wildlife trafficking and biopiracy aimed at rural and urban populations.

³⁷ Albania, Algeria, Andorra, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahrain, Belarus, Belgium, Bhutan, Bolivia, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Cabo Verde, Cambodia, Canada, Chad, Cuba, Czechia, Chile, China, Congo, Croatia, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, Equatorial Guinea, Eritrea, Estonia, Ethiopia, European Union, Finland, Gambia, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guinea-Bissau, Guinea, Honduras, Hungary, India, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Jordan, Kiribati, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People’s Democratic Republic, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malaysia, Mali, Malta, Montenegro, Mozambique, Nauru, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Norway, Pakistan, Paraguay, Peru, Poland, Qatar, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Russian Federation, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Samoa, San Marino, Sao Tome and Principe, Serbia, Sierra Leone, Slovakia, Solomon Islands, South Africa, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, Tajikistan, Thailand, Togo, Turkmenistan, Uganda, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam, Vanuatu, Zambia and Zimbabwe.

31. A total of 129 Parties³⁸ have set national targets and/or objectives in relation to Aichi Biodiversity Target 1.

3. Capacity development

32. A total of 97 countries³⁹ list several capacity-building activities, some of which also indicate the budget allocated as well as the entity in charge of the activity. The NBSAPs of 18 Parties⁴⁰ referred to the National Capacity Self-Assessment and/or other training/capacity needs assessments. A total of 20 NBSAPs⁴¹ include a national capacity development plan; examples of these plans are presented below:⁴²

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

(b) One of the components of the implementation plan of Liberia is the Capacity Development Plan, which includes an assessment of technical capacity needs at systemic, institutional and individual levels;

(c) In addition to its Capacity Development Framework and Action Plan, Palau prepared a Technology Needs Assessment;

(d) The Capacity-Building Plan of Rwanda is targeted for entities involved in biodiversity conservation, agro-biodiversity, biotechnology and biosafety. Activities will be undertaken at various training institutions, and will promote gender as a cross-cutting issue in biodiversity planning;

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

³⁸ Albania, Algeria, Andorra, Antigua and Barbuda, Azerbaijan, Armenia, Austria, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Belarus, Belgium, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brazil, Burundi, Cabo Verde, Cambodia, Canada, Cuba, Czechia, Chile, China, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Djibouti, Ecuador, Egypt, Equatorial Guinea, Eritrea, Estonia, Eswatini, Ethiopia, Gambia, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guinea-Bissau, Guinea, Guyana, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Liberia, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mexico, Micronesia (Federated States of), Mongolia, Montenegro, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Nigeria, Niue, North Macedonia, Pakistan, Palau, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Republic of Korea, Qatar, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Russian Federation, Rwanda, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, San Marino, Senegal, Serbia, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Solomon Islands, Somalia, South Africa, South Sudan, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Sweden, Switzerland, Tajikistan, Thailand, Timor-Leste, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Vanuatu, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Zambia and Zimbabwe.

³⁹ Algeria, Andorra, Argentina, Armenia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bangladesh, Burkina Faso, Bahrain, Belize, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Cabo Verde, Cambodia, Cameroon, Chad, Czechia, Chile, China, Comoros, Congo, Croatia, Cuba, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Djibouti, Dominica, Egypt, Eritrea, Eswatini, Georgia, Greece, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea-Bissau, Guinea, Guyana, Honduras, Hungary, India, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Japan, Jordan, Kiribati, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mauritania, Mexico, Micronesia (Federated States of), Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nauru, Nepal, Nicaragua, Niger, North Macedonia, Pakistan, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Senegal, Serbia, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, Slovakia, South Africa, South Sudan, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Tajikistan, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Turkey, Turkmenistan, Tuvalu, Uganda, Uruguay, United Kingdom, Zambia and Zimbabwe.

⁴⁰ Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Cambodia, Cameroon, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Dominican Republic, Eritrea, Guyana, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Mauritius, Mongolia, Niue, Romania, Samoa, Suriname, Timor-Leste and Tuvalu.

⁴¹ Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Burundi, Comoros, Guyana, Indonesia, Lebanon, Liberia, Malawi, Maldives, Mali, Mauritius, Morocco, Nigeria, Niue, Palau, Republic of Korea, Rwanda, Suriname, and Timor-Leste.

⁴² Afghanistan, Bangladesh, Belize, Congo, Jamaica, Nepal, Peru, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Seychelles and Somalia.

(f) The Republic of Korea plans to carry out capacity-building activities at national level in regard to numerous issues, including: citizen monitoring of coastal wetland protected areas, awareness-raising on the Nagoya Protocol for domestic industries, forest education, implementation of local biodiversity strategies, CITES implementation, and upgrading tourism infrastructure. The country also plans to strengthen its efforts in regard to international cooperation, including expanding support for various on-going projects. such the [Bio-Bridge Initiative](#), [Peace and Biodiversity Dialogue Initiative](#), Korea Biosafety Capacity Building Initiative, [Forest Ecosystem Restoration Initiative](#), and the [Sustainable Ocean Initiative](#), that are contributing to building capacity at the international level for implementing the Convention;

(g) Kuwait plans to build capacity in relation to biotechnology.

D. Mainstreaming

1. Valuation of biodiversity and ecosystem services

33. A total of 47 Parties⁴³ report having conducted valuation studies of the biodiversity in their country or parts thereof. There is not enough information, however, to determine if the results of these exercises have been significantly considered in setting priorities, mainstreaming and/or developing the revised NBSAP. Some examples of valuation studies conducted are:

(a) As part of updating its NBSAP, Bangladesh conducted an economic valuation of the 50 services provided by three ecosystems (hill forest, wetland and mangrove);

(b) Cabo Verde has done valuation studies for ecotourism, and forests;

(c) Egypt — Wadi El Rayan and Ras Mohamed protected areas;

(d) Jamaica conducted the [Cockpit Country Ecosystem valuation study](#) in 2011, whereby the feasibility of implementing a sustainable funding mechanism for ocean and coastal management was explored;

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

(f) The NBSAP of Mexico is largely based on the provisions contained in the document *Natural Capital of Mexico: Strategic Actions for Valuation, Preservation and Restoration* (2012) ([Capital natural de México: Acciones estratégicas para su valoración, preservación y recuperación](#) (2012));

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

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

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

(j) Through implementation of the earlier NBSAP (2014-2018), the Republic of Korea completed a valuation study on the ecosystem services provided by rice paddies. Implementation of the earlier NBSAP also assisted with the incorporation of biodiversity values in legal plans for different sectors, including forestry and oceans, thereby facilitating biodiversity mainstreaming in ministries and agencies. Actions that will be carried out to implement the current NBSAP (2019-2023) include the preparation of valuation standards, through discovery and selection of key forest ecosystem services, as well as improvement of functional assessment indicators. The Republic of Korea also intends to revise the

⁴³ Bangladesh, Botswana, Bhutan, Brazil, Cabo Verde, Chile, Colombia, Denmark, Egypt, El Salvador, Ethiopia, European Union, Georgia, Germany, Grenada, Guyana, Indonesia, Ireland, Jamaica, Japan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Maldives, Malta, Mauritius, Mongolia, Myanmar, Mexico, Montenegro, Netherlands, Norway, Paraguay, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Russian Federation, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Sao Tome and Principe, Seychelles, Sri Lanka, Sweden, Switzerland, Turkey, Uganda, Uruguay, Viet Nam, Yemen and Zimbabwe.

Act on the Conservation and Use of Biological Diversity, which provides the legal basis for the definition of ecosystem services, including their measurement and valuation.

34. Of the 167 NBSAPs reviewed, 46 countries⁴⁴ have set national targets on valuation and 52 state the intention of conducting valuation studies in the future.⁴⁵ For example:

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

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

(c) Kuwait is currently conducting a biodiversity valuation project in partnership with the International Union for Conservation of Nature.

2. National development plans

35. A total of 40 Parties^{46, 47} state that biodiversity has been integrated into their national development plan or equivalent instrument:

(a) The NBSAP of Algeria is integrated with the country's "[Schéma National d'Aménagement du Territoire Algérie](#)" (national spatial planning scheme), which is the Government's strategic planning tool for land use and sustainable development;

(b) Biodiversity figures prominently in the [eleventh Five Year Plan of Bhutan \(2013-2018\)](#);

(c) The NBSAP revision process of Ecuador took place concurrently with the preparation of the "[Plan Nacional para el Buen Vivir 2013-2017](#)" (national development plan). Several national policies that are part of Objective 7⁴⁸ are directly related to biodiversity;

(d) Biodiversity is considered in the [National Development Plan of Mexico](#). Policies and tools on conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity in the NBSAP are directly related to the actions in the National Development Plan. The Plan also considers mainstreaming biodiversity in the agriculture, fisheries and tourism sectors;

(e) The "[Plan de développement économique et social](#)" of Niger takes biodiversity into consideration in two of its axes: one on balanced and sustainable development and another on sustainable food security and agricultural development;

⁴⁴ Algeria, Argentina, Armenia, Antigua and Barbuda, Bangladesh, Belarus, Belgium, Bhutan, Burundi, Cameroon, Congo, Chile, Dominican Republic, Equatorial Guinea, Estonia, Gambia, Georgia, Greece, Guatemala, India, Japan, Jordan, Kuwait, Mali, Malawi, Mauritania, Micronesia (Federated States of), Mozambique, Namibia, Nigeria, North Macedonia, Panama, Peru, Republic of Korea, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Senegal, Singapore, Somalia, South Sudan, Switzerland, Trinidad and Tobago, Turkey, Uganda, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay and Yemen.

⁴⁵ Andorra, Antigua and Barbuda, Armenia, Belarus, Belgium, Belize, Burundi, Cambodia, Cameroon, Comoros, Croatia, Cuba, Dominica, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Equatorial Guinea, Estonia, Eswatini, Finland, France, Gambia, Guatemala, India, Japan, Jordan, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Ireland, Italy, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malta, Namibia, Nauru, Nepal, Niger, Nigeria, Pakistan, Peru, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Rwanda, Sao Tome and Principe, Slovakia, Somalia, Suriname, Timor-Leste, Togo, Turkmenistan, Tuvalu, Vanuatu and Zambia.

⁴⁶ Algeria, Bangladesh, Belize, Bolivia, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Bhutan, China, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Equatorial Guinea, Estonia, Honduras, Iraq, Kiribati, Malawi, Mexico, Micronesia (Federated States of), Namibia, Netherlands, New Zealand, Niger, Niue, Peru, Philippines, Rwanda, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Slovakia, South Africa, Thailand, Timor-Leste, Trinidad and Tobago, Turkey, Uganda, United Kingdom, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam and United Republic of Tanzania.

⁴⁷ Information on the integration of biodiversity in national development plans or equivalent instruments takes into consideration information received from Parties since the fourteenth meeting of the Conference of the Parties, in response to email inquiries from the Secretariat (decision 14/1, para. 22) and in response to notification 2020-019 dated 14 February 2020, through which CBD national focal points, Cartagena Protocol focal points, ABS focal points, SBSTTA focal points, and indigenous peoples and local communities and relevant organizations were advised that the draft version of this document would be available on the Convention's website for peer review until 6 March 2020.

⁴⁸ Objective 7 refers to guaranteeing the rights of nature and promoting environmental sustainability.

(f) The “[Plan Bicentenario](#)” of Peru, entitled “El Perú hacia el 2021”, recognizes and positions biodiversity conservation as a national objective;

(g) Saint Vincent and the Grenadines’ NBSAP shows linkages between its National Targets and the [National Economic and Social Development Plan \(NESDP\) \(2013-2025\)](#) goals; it also includes specific actions that need to be taken to achieve the NBSAP targets and the NESDP goals;

(h) The [Timor-Leste Strategic Development Plan](#) commits to meeting several of the Aichi Biodiversity Targets;

(i) In the Federated States of Micronesia, biodiversity considerations are integrated in the [Strategic Development Plan 2004-2023](#);

(j) In Trinidad and Tobago, biodiversity has been incorporated in the [National Development Strategy 2016-2030 \(Vision 2030\)](#), under Theme V “Placing the Environment at the Centre of Socioeconomic Development”;

(k) [In China’s 13th Five-Year Plan for National Economic and Social Development \(2016-2020\)](#), many issues refer to biodiversity-related matters, such as biodiversity conservation, ecosystem restoration, climate change, sustainable agriculture and environmental management. Moreover, conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity have been substantially integrated in the Ecological Conservation Redline Policy;

(l) In New Zealand, biodiversity is integrated into national economic and sustainable development planning in a number of different ways, including through the “[Wellbeing Budget](#)”. The Budget contains specific references to the need to address biodiversity decline, greenhouse gas emissions, the quality of waterways, soil erosion, and other environmental issues.

36. The NBSAPs of 36 other Parties⁴⁹ contain elements and/or targets and actions which aim at mainstreaming with the national development plan or equivalent instrument. For example, Mauritius completed a biodiversity mainstreaming assessment for key industries and themes during the preparation of the NBSAP and is planning an assessment of potential pathways, barriers and opportunities to mainstream biodiversity in public policy and decision-making. North Macedonia intends to carry out actions to gradually integrate biodiversity values in national development plans. South Sudan aims to mainstream biodiversity values in national development plans and budget framework papers.

3. Sustainable development plans

37. Of the 167 NBSAPs reviewed, 26 Parties^{50,51} mention an integration of their NBSAP with their sustainable development plans or equivalent instruments. For example:

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

(b) The [National Strategy for Sustainable Development](#) of Montenegro contains actions on protected areas;

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

⁴⁹ Andorra, Armenia, Bahrain, Belgium, Botswana, Cabo Verde, Cameroon, Chile, Colombia, Comoros, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Egypt, Finland, France, Ghana, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Ireland, Italy, Jamaica, Kuwait, Malawi, Mauritius, Montenegro, Nigeria, North Macedonia, Pakistan, Qatar, Romania, San Marino, Solomon Islands, South Africa, South Sudan, United Kingdom, Zambia and Zimbabwe.

⁵⁰ Belgium, Belize, Czechia, Estonia, Ethiopia, European Union, Finland, France, Ireland, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People’s Democratic Republic, Luxembourg, Mauritania, Montenegro, Morocco, Myanmar, Niger, Republic of Korea, Romania, Serbia, Seychelles, South Africa, Spain, Switzerland, Timor-Leste and Vanuatu.

⁵¹ Information on the integration of biodiversity in sustainable development plans or equivalent instruments takes into consideration information received from Parties since the fourteenth meeting of the Conference of the Parties, in response to email inquiries from the Secretariat (decision 14/1, para. 22).

(d) The National Biodiversity Strategy of France is a major component of the National Sustainable Development Strategy (SNDD);

(e) For Luxembourg, the NBSAP is a subcomponent of the National Sustainable Development Plan;

(f) The NBSAP of Niger is part of one of six programmes comprising the National Plan for the Environment for Sustainable Development ([Plan National de L'environnement pour un Développement Durable \(PNEDD\)](#));

(g) The NBSAP of the Republic of Korea has been integrated in the Third Master Plan for Sustainable Development (2016-2035).

4. Poverty eradication

38. A total of 47 Parties' post-Nagoya NBSAPs^{52,53} mention links to poverty eradication and/or integrate this objective into their principles, targets and/or actions. For example:

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

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

(c) The NBSAPs of Afghanistan, Moldova, Namibia, Niger and Peru aim to implement biodiversity actions in order to contribute to poverty alleviation. The NBSAP of Namibia, through its [Community Based Natural Resource Management Programme](#), monitors the role that biodiversity plays in poverty alleviation in rural areas;

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

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

(f) A guiding principle of the NBSAP of South Sudan is that implementation should contribute to poverty reduction and economic development.

5. Subnational level plans

39. The post-Nagoya NBSAPs of 10 Parties⁵⁴ mention that their country either already has subnational biodiversity plans or has started developing them (examples appear below). The Secretariat is aware of 19 Parties (including 6 mentioned above) that have at least one subnational biodiversity action plan,⁵⁵ however, not all of these are reflected in the revised NBSAPs. Information on these can be found

⁵² Afghanistan, Antigua and Barbuda, Belgium, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cabo Verde, Cambodia, China, Congo, Comoros, Cote d'Ivoire, Equatorial Guinea, Ethiopia, Finland, Gambia, Georgia, Guinea, Guyana, India, Italy, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Madagascar, Mali, Morocco, Namibia, Nicaragua, Nigeria, Niger, North Macedonia, Peru, Philippines, Republic of Moldova, Rwanda, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Solomon Islands, South Africa, South Sudan, Sudan, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Uganda, United Republic of Tanzania and Yemen.

⁵³ Information on Parties that mention links between biodiversity and poverty eradication takes into consideration information received from Parties since the fourteenth meeting of the Conference of the Parties in response to email inquiries from the Secretariat (decision 14/1, para. 22).

⁵⁴ Austria, Ireland, Japan, Mexico, Mauritius, Peru, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Republic of Korea, United Kingdom and Vanuatu.

⁵⁵ <https://www.cbd.int/nbsap/related-info/sbsap/default.shtml>

at: <https://www.cbd.int/nbsap/related-info/sbsap/default.shtml>. A total of 11 other Parties⁵⁶ mention their intent to prepare subnational biodiversity strategies and actions plans:

(a) Ireland has either finalized or drafted 26 local biodiversity action plans. Some of them are up for review, and additional local plans will be prepared;

(b) Mexico has promoted decentralized biodiversity planning and management through the development and implementation of 12 State Strategies for Conservation and Sustainable Use of Biodiversity. Additional State Strategies are currently under preparation;

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

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

41. A total of 26 other NBSAPs⁵⁷ contain elements, actions or targets that aim to integrate biodiversity into subnational level plans:

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

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

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

(d) The Republic of Korea has developed guidelines for planning local biodiversity strategies and is establishing a legal basis for metropolitan cities/provinces to set up biodiversity strategies in the [Act on the Conservation and Use of Biodiversity](#);

(e) In the Federated States of Micronesia, each State has its own Strategic Development Plan which integrates biodiversity;

(f) North Macedonia intends to carry out actions to gradually integrate biodiversity values in local development plans;

(g) South Sudan aims to mainstream biodiversity values in state and county development plans.

6. Gender

42. A total of 76 Parties⁵⁸ make reference to gender or women's issues in their NBSAPs. A review of the implementation of the 2015-2020 Gender Plan of Action, focusing on information contained in the

⁵⁶ Bosnia and Herzegovina, China, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Ireland, Malawi, Myanmar, Nepal, Nigeria, Russian Federation, Ukraine and United Kingdom.

⁵⁷ Australia, Belgium, Bolivia, Burundi, Cambodia, Cameroon, Canada, Democratic Republic of the Congo, France, India, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Malta, Malawi, Malaysia, Micronesia (Federated States of), Nigeria, North Macedonia, Norway, Republic of Korea, Russian Federation, South Sudan, Sudan, Switzerland, Thailand, United Kingdom, and Zimbabwe.

⁵⁸ Azerbaijan, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Bhutan, Bolivia, Brazil, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cabo Verde, Cambodia, Cameroon, Chad, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Cuba, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, Equatorial Guinea, Eritrea, Ethiopia, Gambia, Georgia, Ghana, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Honduras, India, Iraq, Jamaica, Japan, Kiribati, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Liberia, Madagascar, Malawi, Mali, Mauritania, Mexico, Micronesia (Federated States of), Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nauru, Nepal, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Pakistan, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Rwanda, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Solomon Islands, South Sudan, Sudan, Thailand, Timor-Leste, Togo, Tunisia, Tuvalu, Uganda, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Vanuatu, Yemen, and Zimbabwe.

sixth national reports and two global surveys carried out by the Secretariat, is provided in CBD/SBI/3/2/Add.3.
