



Convention on Biological Diversity

Distr.: General
13 January 2026
English only

Subsidiary Body on Implementation

Sixth meeting

Rome, 16–19 February 2026

Item 4 of the provisional agenda*

**Planning, monitoring, reporting and review: update on
national biodiversity strategies and action plans, national
targets and national reporting**

Progress in operationalizing the voluntary peer review mechanism of the Convention**

Note by the Secretariat

I. Background

1. At its fourteenth meeting, in its decision [14/29](#), the Conference of the Parties included the voluntary peer review (VPR) as an element of the multidimensional review approach under the Convention and requested the Executive Secretary to facilitate further voluntary peer reviews, and to invite Parties to volunteer for a review and to nominate candidates for the review teams.
2. At its fifteenth meeting, the Conference of the Parties, in its decision [15/6](#) and section J of the Kunming-Montreal Global Biodiversity Framework¹ on transparency and responsibility, included VPR in the Convention's enhanced multidimensional approach to planning, monitoring, reporting and review.
3. In 2024, the Secretariat updated the VPR methodology developed in 2016 and contained in document [CBD/COP/13/INF/2](#), in order to align it with the Framework and recent decisions of the Conference of the Parties.
4. In March 2025 the Secretariat issued notification No. 2025-032 inviting Parties to engage with the VPR mechanism by nominating reviewers, volunteering to undergo a review and/or by submitting views on the updated methodology.
5. The Secretariat received 25 official nominations from 15 Parties for volunteer reviewers. Of these, 3 volunteers have participated in previous VPRs while the rest are new to the mechanism.
6. The Secretariat received three expressions of interest from Parties to undergo reviews. The Secretariat launched a review of Luxembourg's national biodiversity strategy and action plan in December 2025. It is envisioned that the review report will be made available to the seventh meeting of the Subsidiary Body on Implementation. Discussions are ongoing with the other two Parties who have expressed interest.

* [CBD/SBI/6/1](#).

** The present document is being issued without formal editing.

¹ Decision [15/4](#), annex.

7. The Secretariat received comments from one Party on the revised and updated methodology. These were incorporated to the draft issued with notification No. 2025-032. The updated methodology is available in the annex to the present document.

Annex

Methodology for voluntary peer review of the revision and implementation of national biodiversity strategies and action plans

I. Background

1. The present note contains an amendment to the methodology for the voluntary peer review (VPR) of national biodiversity strategies and action plans contained in document [UNEP/CBD/COP/13/INF/2](#). The amended methodology takes account of the Kunming-Montreal Global Biodiversity Framework, other decisions of the Conference of the Parties, including its decision 15/6, and recent developments in the online reporting tool.
2. The VPR is a process by which a group of Parties to the Convention review another Party's implementation of the Convention. Throughout the process, VPR stimulates mutual experience-sharing, learning and capacity-building for both reviewers and Parties whose national biodiversity strategies and action plans are under review. The objective is to strengthen Parties' capacities to implement the Convention.
3. The VPR process was developed and refined by request of the Conference of the Parties under its standing items on Efficiency of Processes under the Convention, and Review of Implementation of the Convention and has been implemented with the generous support from Japan, through the Japan Biodiversity Fund, Norway and Switzerland. At its ninth² and eleventh³ meetings, the Conference of the Parties requested the Executive Secretary to facilitate "the continued exchange of best practices and lessons learned from the preparation, updating and implementation of national biodiversity strategies and action plans, through appropriate forums and mechanisms such as the clearing-house mechanism and, subject to available resources, strengthened cooperation with regional processes, South-South cooperation and voluntary peer review" and invited "Parties and other Governments to undertake voluntary peer review of NBSAPs and their implementation, and to share experiences deriving from it through the Executive Secretary and the clearing-house mechanism".
4. The Secretariat facilitated an informal working group⁴ that developed, in an iterative and participatory fashion, a draft methodology for VPR. The methodology was tested in Ethiopia and India. It was later refined, upon the request of the Conference of the Parties at its twelfth meeting, and presented to the first meeting of the Subsidiary Body on Implementation in document [UNEP/CBD/SBI/1/10/Add.1](#).
5. At its thirteenth meeting, the Conference of the Parties, in its decision [XIII/25](#),⁵ took note of the progress made, and requested the Executive Secretary to facilitate the further testing and development of the methodology, including its application through a pilot phase. The pilot phase comprised full-fledged reviews in Montenegro, Sri Lanka and Uganda.

II. Introduction

6. The Voluntary Peer Review (VPR) is a process by which a group of Parties to the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD) review another Party's implementation of the Convention. Throughout the process, VPR stimulates mutual experience-sharing, learning and capacity-building

² See decision [IX/8](#) subparagraph 16 (a).

³ See decision [XI/2](#), paragraphs 2 and 9.

⁴ The group included advisers from China, Belarus, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Bosnia and Herzegovina, Brazil, Ethiopia, European Union, Georgia, India, Japan, Malaysia, Mexico, Nepal, Nigeria, Norway, Palau, Republic of Korea, South Africa, Switzerland and Viet Nam, with additional inputs and presentations from the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development and United Nations Economic Commission for Europe Environmental Performance Review Units.

⁵ <https://www.cbd.int/doc/decisions/cop-13/cop-13-dec-25-en.pdf>

for both reviewers and Parties whose national biodiversity strategy and action plan (NBSAP) is under review. The objective is to strengthen Parties' capacities to implement the Convention

III. Objectives and principles

7. The objective of the VPR is to help Parties to enhance their individual and collective capacities to more effectively implement the Convention and the Kunming-Montreal Global Biodiversity Framework.
8. The VPR is open to all Parties to the Convention. "Peer" indicates that the review takes place among Parties to the Convention and that all reviewers are nominated by their respective governments.
9. The VPR provides the Party whose NBSAP is under review with observations and recommendations, developed by peers after a detailed study of their documents and current situation, which they can use to improve their NBSAP revision and updating process and/or to improve the implementation of their NBSAP and other relevant instruments. The overall process stimulates mutual experience-sharing, learning and capacity-building with potential benefits for all Parties to the Convention.
10. The specific objectives are as follows:
 - (a) To assess the development/revision and implementation of NBSAPs and to produce specific recommendations for the Parties whose NBSAPs are under review to make their processes, and their implementation efforts more effective;
 - (b) To provide opportunities for peer learning and to stimulate enhanced cooperation among Parties;
 - (c) To create greater transparency and responsibility for NBSAP development and implementation as outlined in section J of the Kunming-Montreal Global Biodiversity Framework.
 - (d) To provide a basis on which Parties can develop specific requests for support through various matchmaking and resourcing initiatives.
11. The review is based on an established methodology and is undertaken based on mutual trust between the review team and the Party whose NBSAP is under review. The latter is invited to "fact-check" the report produced by the review team and can decide whether to respond formally to its recommendations, and how to otherwise use the information in the review report.
12. The in-country visit of the VPR process is intended for broad participation of relevant Government institutions and national stakeholders in the review process. It can be an opportunity for building or strengthening relationships with these actors.
13. The VPR can be used by the Secretariat to identify and highlight common lessons about what works well (leading to progress) and what works less well (leading to little or no progress) and to share this more broadly among the Parties to the Convention.

IV. Scope of the voluntary peer review process

14. The VPR process should focus on the overall biodiversity policy process in the country whose NBSAP is under review and may also address a few key policy areas and issues that the Party would like to focus on. These would be identified considering policy priorities as well as areas where the Party is facing the greatest challenges. They would be communicated during the completion of the scoping exercise in appendix 1 (see below).
15. Key policy areas or issues that the VPR may focus on include (but are not limited to):
 - (a) Implementation of the goals and targets of the Kunming-Montreal Global Biodiversity Framework;

- (b) Integrating considerations in section C of the Framework into the NBSAP;
- (c) Integrating considerations in sections I, J and K of the Framework into the NBSAP;
- (d) Making NBSAPs effective planning instruments that are action-driven, practical, and prioritized;
- (e) Utilization of evidence and barriers/limitations to utilizing evidence (e.g. availability of evidence) in NBSAP development;
- (f) Mainstreaming biodiversity concerns into relevant sectoral or cross-sectoral plans, programmes and policies;
- (g) Synergies with the other biodiversity-related conventions and other relevant multilateral environmental agreements;
- (h) Biodiversity finance and resource mobilization;
- (i) Development and enhancement of national capacity to implement the Convention;
- (j) Putting a whole-of-government and whole-of-society approach into practice - engaging indigenous peoples and local communities, and all relevant sectors and stakeholders including representatives of society that have a significant impact on, benefit from (or depend on), or responsibility for biodiversity and ecosystem services;
- (k) National institutional arrangements for the promotion, coordination and monitoring of the implementation of the NBSAP;
- (l) Communication for biodiversity awareness and action;
- (m) Regional, subregional or subnational networks to support implementation of the Convention;
- (n) Promoting and supporting local action for the implementation of the NBSAP;
- (o) Implementing the Gender Plan of Action.

V. The voluntary peer review process

1. Initiation of the process – expressions of interest and scoping exercise

16. In response to a notification on the subject, any Party wishing to have their NBSAP process and implementation reviewed indicates this in writing by email to secretariat@cbd.int. The request must be provided by the CBD National Focal Point, or higher authority. The application should be accompanied by a completed scoping exercise using the template in appendix 1 (see below).

17. Eligibility of Parties to have their NBSAP process and implementation reviewed is guided by the following criteria:

- (a) Evidence of high-level government support for the VPR process;
- (b) Latest national report submitted;
- (c) Country has an advanced draft, or has completed the revision and updating of its last NBSAP in line with the Kunming-Montreal Global Biodiversity Framework;
- (d) Agreement to provide logistical and administrative support for the review. This may include making relevant documents available, explaining the institutional setup and identifying relevant national stakeholders, setting up meetings with key government offices and stakeholders, organizing local transportation, etc.

(e) Willingness to cover in-country costs of the review such as internal transportation and coffee breaks.⁶

18. Parties interested in having their NBSAP process and implementation reviewed, and meeting these criteria, meet with the Secretariat to go over the purpose, expectations and focus topics for the VPR exercise in the country, and to discuss the timeline and roles and responsibilities during the review.

19. Agreement for a VPR exercise in a country is formalized through an exchange of letters between the Secretariat and the country volunteering to have their NBSAP reviewed.

20. In the event that there are numerous requests, the Secretariat, in consultation with the Bureau of the Conference of the Parties, selects the Parties whose NBSAPs will be reviewed, taking into account regional balance among Parties whose NBSAPs have been reviewed to date, and availability of suitable reviewers⁷.

21. A budget should be prepared and funding secured before any review exercise can be initiated.

2. Establishment of review team

22. The Secretariat invites, through a notification, all Parties to nominate candidates to be part of review teams. Candidates may be CBD National Focal Points, NBSAP coordinators, experts serving in regional Technical and Scientific Cooperation Support Centres or other experts nominated by their government.

23. Selected candidates serve in their individual expert capacity.

24. The Secretariat forms a balanced review team, taking into consideration candidates' availability, experience with peer review and expertise related to the characteristics of the country whose NBSAP will be reviewed with respect to biodiversity, governance system and language. The review team comprises four to six reviewers, plus Secretariat support.

25. Once the review team has been established, the members identify a team leader, agree on responsibilities, and create a proposed timeline for the review to be presented to and agreed with the Party whose NBSAP will be reviewed.

26. The review team discusses and decides how the areas or issues of special interest expressed by the country whose NBSAP is under review in their scoping exercise can be pursued, in addition to the general review. Within the review team, in addition to a team leader, lead reviewers could be identified for the various areas of focus or themes of the study.

3. Roles and responsibilities

27. Party whose NBSAP development and implementation will be reviewed:

(a) Identify a central contact person in the country for the VPR exercise.

(b) Make relevant documents and information available. Clarify information as necessary (e.g. explaining the institutional setup)

(c) Collaborate with the Secretariat and the review team on the development of the programme for the in-country visit.

(d) Provide logistical and administrative support for the in-country visit. This may include facilitating issuance of visas for review team (in case necessary), identifying relevant national stakeholders, setting up meetings with key government offices and stakeholders, organizing local transportation, etc.

⁶ For reviewers from developing countries, other costs such as accommodation and meals will be covered through voluntary funds dedicated for this purpose. Developed country reviewers are to be responsible for their own expenses.

⁷ Additional criteria may be relevant in the future.

(e) Willingness to cover in-country costs of the review such as internal transportation and coffee breaks;⁸

(f) Provide factual corrections and clarifications on the draft report;

(g) Provide a written response to the final report;

(h) Provide post-review feedback on the value of the review process.

28. The review team:

Team leader:

(a) Set aside adequate time to lead and fully participate in the review;

(b) Provide overall coordination of the review, in conjunction with the Secretariat;

(c) Liaise between the Secretariat and the review team members;

(d) Take part in the review of relevant documents for the desk study and lead the drafting of report.

(e) Facilitate the allocation of team tasks and follow-up on their completion;

(f) Ensure review-team members agree with (collective ownership) the results of the review;

(g) Introduce the team and facilitate the discussion in the in-country visit meetings

(h) Lead and coordinate the preparation and completion of the final report;

(i) Liaise with the Party whose NBSAP is under review on the finalization of the report and the submission of the final report to the Secretariat.

Reviewers:

(a) Set aside adequate time to fully participate in the review;⁹

(b) Develop and agree on a work plan and timetable;

(c) Conduct the desk-study and actively contribute to a preparatory note for the in-country visit, including potential interview questions and a preliminary structure for the final report;

(d) Develop the programme for the in-country visit, in conjunction with the Secretariat

(e) Participate in the in-country visit;

(f) Contribute actively to the preparation and finalization of the report.

29. The Secretariat

(a) Form a review team taking into consideration candidates' availability, experience, expertise, language skills, as well as regional and gender balance;

(b) Provide overall coordination of the review, in conjunction with the review team leader;

(c) Provide the necessary logistic support to the review team, including funding (travel and daily subsistence allowance) for reviewers from developing countries;

(d) Assist in collecting information for the desk-study;

⁸ For reviewers from developing countries, other costs such as accommodation and meals will be covered through voluntary funds dedicated for this purpose. Developed country reviewers are to be responsible for their own expenses.

⁹ Potential reviewers should be aware that the desk study tasks may take several weeks of their time, and that completing the report of the review may need to be spread over several weeks after they have returned from the in-country visit.

- (e) Provide coordination and support, and assist in the development of the programme for the in-country visit;
- (f) Participate in the in-country visit;
- (g) Assist with the preparation and development of the review report as appropriate;
- (h) Post the final review report on the relevant CBD webpages;
- (i) Use the results of the reviews for broader capacity-building and learning among Parties more generally.

4. Desk study, draft report and work programme for in-country visit

30. The desk study is an essential component of the review exercise that lays the foundation on which the in-country visit and the final report are built. The desk study should build on the scoping exercise (Appendix 1) completed by the Party whose NBSAP development and implementation are under review when applying for the VPR exercise to be conducted in their country. It should be based on the template in Appendix 2, focusing on good examples as well as on barriers to implementation identified in the country's national report and other sources.

31. The latest NBSAP and national report (NR) are the basic documents for use during the desk study. Earlier versions of these documents may assist in reviewing progress over a longer timeframe. An indicative checklist of documents which could be used for desk study is provided in Appendix 3. Additional information identified and obtained during the desk study, for example, video documentaries, can also be helpful.

32. While reviewing documents for the desk study the review team should take notes and formulate two sets of observations, (a) those that need further clarification/verification during the in-country visit and (b) those which can already be used to start a draft final report. An initial structure for the final report should be agreed upon and the drafting may commence during the desk review and before the in-country visit.

33. While finalizing the desk study, the review team drafts a work programme for the in-country visit. This is sent to the Party whose NBSAP is being reviewed for comment and dialogue to finalize the in-country work programme. The desk study is to be completed sufficiently in advance of the in-country visit to allow the necessary logistic arrangements.

34. A minimum of two months is required between the start of the desk study and the implementation of the in-country visit for the review exercise to be efficient and effective. The main output of the desk study should be a draft report which will be further developed during and after the in-country visit to become the final report of the review.

5. In-country visit

35. The precise programme for each in-country visit is to be developed and agreed by the review team in collaboration with the National Focal Point of the country whose NBSAP is under review, taking into consideration the roles and responsibilities outlined above, and the outputs of the desk study.

36. A national coordinator, identified by the National Focal Point of the country whose NBSAP is under review, arranges and confirms meetings in advance of the country visit. Using the draft list of stakeholders to be met, the Secretariat agrees with the host country on the national stakeholders to be contacted during the in-country visit and the modalities of the contacts – group meeting, separate interviews, etc. The possible need for a field visit or a visit to stakeholders outside the capital is also discussed and decided.

37. Where possible and practical, initial communication with main stakeholders via teleconference could be conducted to clarify some of the observations arising from the desk review in advance of the in-country visit.

38. The number of days required, and the exact dates of the country visit are decided, taking into consideration the availability of stakeholders, reviewers, and Secretariat staff and the budget available.

39. In coordination with the host country, a programme for the in-country visit is prepared by the team leader, assisted by the Secretariat. The programme should include:

(a) An internal team meeting upon arrival in the country during which an approach to clarifying any uncertainties arising from the desk study is agreed and a decision is made on when (and if) the team should split up and meet again during the in-country visit;

(b) Daily team meetings to consolidate notes between review team members and to evaluate progress and prepare for upcoming meetings;

(c) A final de-briefing meeting to be held with the CBD NFP, or higher office, before departure;

(d) At least a half day at the end of the programme for the review team, for conclusions and report drafting.

40. The final programme is sent to the review team and Secretariat by the host country after confirmation of meetings.

6. Review Report

41. Within two weeks of the end of the in-country visit, each review team member submits a “zero” draft of their agreed contribution to the review report to the team leader and the Secretariat, based on the structure developed in the desk study and confirmed in the in-country visit. The team leader continues to liaise with the review team members and Secretariat to produce the final report. Several teleconferences may be needed, to assist in this process.

42. The final report should clearly reflect the results of the review exercise in line with its objectives. Other than facts, it should include observations and recommendations made by the review team in following their task to review the country’s progress in NBSAP revision and implementation. Reflections from both the reviewing Parties as well as the reviewed Party on peer learning should also be incorporated, as should more general lessons learned from the review process that may have broader relevance to the Convention parties.

43. The final draft report is sent to the Party whose NBSAP is under review within three months of the in-country visit with a request to check the review for any factual errors. The review team subsequently finalizes the report. The Party whose NBSAP is under review may provide a written response to the recommendations of the review and this can be included as an annex to the review.

44. The Secretariat sends the report to the Party whose NBSAP is under review for posting on the national CHM website and also posts the report on the relevant CBD Country pages¹⁰.

45. The Secretariat makes the review report available to the meeting of the Subsidiary Body on Implementation (SBI) as an information document.

VI. Evaluation and progress report to the subsidiary body on implementation

46. The VPR is a part of the Convention’s enhanced multidimensional approach to planning, monitoring, review and reporting. The Secretariat will provide information for SBI to assist in its consideration of the relevant item, including a synthesis report of the VPR processes that have taken place.

¹⁰ <https://www.cbd.int/countries/>

Appendices to the VPR methodology

Appendix 1 Scoping checklist for Parties volunteering for peer review

Appendix 2 NBSAP review template for use in desk study

Appendix 3 Indicative list of documents to be used for desk assessment

Appendix 1: Scoping checklist for Parties volunteering for peer review of their NBSAP development and implementation

In order to be considered for voluntary peer review a set of information is required to enable the Secretariat and potential reviewing Parties to quickly assess the needs and priorities of the Party wishing to have their NBSAP reviewed.

The checklist is divided into three sections: (i) Pre-requisite information, (ii) Scoping, and (iii) Progress and challenges.

Please complete the three parts of the checklist and return to <secretariat@cbd.int>

Part 1 Pre-requisite information

1. Name of Party	
2. Contact point within country (Name, Title, Address, Telephone, Email)	
3. Level of government endorsing this request	
4. Indicative date for initiation of review (including desk review, and for in-country visit)	

Part 2 Scoping

1. Why is your country interested in undergoing a peer review process?	
2. How do you plan to take up the findings of the VPR process in your country?	
3. Which ministries will be involved in the VPR process?	
4. Which other stakeholders will be involved in the VPR process?	
5. Is there currently an active biodiversity coordination mechanism, committee or equivalent whose members can be available for interview (either remotely or in person)?	

6. Please list the biodiversity relevant sectors where you feel that mainstreaming (integration) of biodiversity has been relatively successful, and also list those where (more) progress is needed.	
7. Please list all subnational biodiversity strategy and action plans that have been developed, adopted and are under implementation.	
8. Please list (up to) five priority areas of NBSAP revision and implementation that you would like the review process to focus on.	

Part 3 Progress and challenges in implementation of the Convention

Please use the checkboxes to rank your country's progress or the difficulties experienced with each of the issues listed on a scale of 1 (good progress) to 5 (very challenging).

Successes and Challenges in Implementing the Convention on Biological Diversity					
Political/Legal/Societal					
1. Mainstreaming and integration of biodiversity issues into other sectors, including use of tools such as environmental impact assessments	1	2	3	4	5
	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
2. Using a whole of government and whole of society approach/ ensuring the engagement of a range of societal actors	1	2	3	4	5
	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
3. Political will and support to implement the Convention on Biological Diversity	1	2	3	4	5
	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
4. Appropriate policies and laws	1	2	3	4	5
	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Institutional, technical and capacity-related					
5. Institutional capacity	1	2	3	4	5
	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
6. Human resources and technical expertise	1	2	3	4	5
	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
7. Suitable technologies	1	2	3	4	5
	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
8. Integrating traditional knowledge	1	2	3	4	5
	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
9. Adequate scientific research capacities to support all the objectives	1	2	3	4	5
	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Accessible knowledge/information					
10. Understanding and documentation of biodiversity and ecosystem services	1	2	3	4	5
	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
11. Utilization of existing scientific and traditional knowledge	1	2	3	4	5
	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
12. Effective communication capacities	1	2	3	4	5
	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
13. Public education and awareness at all levels.	1	2	3	4	5
	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Economic policy and financial resources					

14. Financial resources	1	2	3	4	5
	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
15. Public and private funding	1	2	3	4	5
	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
16. Economic incentive measures	1	2	3	4	5
	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
17. Access and benefit-sharing from the utilization of genetic resources	1	2	3	4	5
	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Collaboration/cooperation					
18. Synergies in implementing other biodiversity-related multilateral environmental agreements	1	2	3	4	5
	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
19. Synergies in implementing the Rio conventions	1	2	3	4	5
	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
20. Horizontal cooperation among stakeholders	1	2	3	4	5
	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
21. Effective partnerships	1	2	3	4	5
	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
22. Engagement of scientific community	1	2	3	4	5
	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Socioeconomic factors					
23. Poverty	1	2	3	4	5
	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
24. Consumption and production patterns	1	2	3	4	5
	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
25. Capacities of actors other than national governments (IPLCs, youth, women, business and finance sectors, academia)	1	2	3	4	5
	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

Appendix 2

NBSAP Review template for use in the desk study¹¹

Part 1: Status of national biodiversity strategy and action plan

Question	Answer
What is the date of adoption of the first NBSAP?	
How many revisions have been undertaken, and what is the status of the most recent version of the NBSAP* (or equivalent)? At what level has it/will it be adopted?	
Does the most recent version of the NBSAP address all of the major thematic areas and cross-cutting issues of the Convention and national priorities relevant to the country whose NBSAP is under review? List here any relevant issues not covered in the NBSAP.	
Where does biodiversity figure in the overall institutional structure for environmental management in the country?	

Part 2: Revision and Updating of the national biodiversity strategy and action plan *

Question	Answer
Has the Party undertaken an analysis of the implementation of its previous NBSAPs?* What were the results?	
Which institution(s) took the lead in revising and updating the NBSAP? Was this sub-contracted to an outside agency?	
Is there a coordination mechanism/committee overseeing the revision, implementation and or monitoring of the NBSAP?* Does it have a monitoring system?*	
Which NBSAP guidelines, if any, were used?	

¹¹ These templates have been developed from the annex to [decision VIII/8](http://www.cbd.int/decision/cop/default.shtml?id=11020)<http://www.cbd.int/decision/cop/default.shtml?id=11020> and from other relevant decisions. There will be some overlap among the different parts of the Appendix.

* Questions with an asterisk are included in the template developed and used by the Secretariat for NBSAP Analysis.

Which other sectors and stakeholders (including Indigenous Peoples and Local Communities) were involved in the NBSAP revision and updating process*? How extensive ¹² was the stakeholder engagement?	
Does the NBSAP contain/acknowledge the contributions of ministries other than the ministry responsible for the environment and/or non-state actors (actors other than national governments)?*	
How was the NBSAP updating/revision financed? And does it contain a finance plan for implementation? *	
How long did the latest revision process take?	
Does the NBSAP make reference to the Cartagena Protocol*?	
Does the NBSAP make reference to the Nagoya Protocol*?	

Part 3. NBSAP components

To what extent are the following generic components included in the updated and revised NBSAP?

NBSAP Component		Notes on quality of representation (give page numbers for back reference)
Introduction	Values of biodiversity and ecosystem services in the country and their contribution to human well-being	
	Causes and consequences of biodiversity loss	
	Constitutional, legal and institutional framework	
	Lessons learned from the implementation of the previous NBSAP(s) and the process of developing the earlier NBSAPs.	
	Long term vision	

¹² **The Spectrum of Public Participation according to the International Association for Public Participation (iPA2):**

- i) **Informing** - Provide the public with balanced and objective information to assist them in understanding the problem, alternatives, opportunities, and/or solutions; ii) **Consulting** - Obtain public feedback on analysis, alternatives, and/or decisions; iii) **Engaging** - Work directly with the public throughout the process to ensure that public concerns and aspirations are consistently understood and considered; iv) **Collaborating** - Partner with the public in each aspect of the decision including the development of alternatives and the identification of the preferred solution; v) **Empowering** - Place final decision-making authority in the hands of citizens.

Strategy: principles, priorities and targets	Principles governing the strategy	
	Main goals or priority areas	
	National Targets (SMART)	
Action plan	National actions to achieve the strategy, with milestones	
	Application of the NBSAP to subnational entities	
	Sectoral and Cross-sectoral Action - mainstreaming into relevant sectors, development, poverty reduction and sustainable development plans climate change and other relevant plans	
	A gender plan of action	
Implementation plan	An action plan with measures/actions, timelines, spatial information (where relevant), source of funds and entity/ies responsible.	
	Plan for capacity development for NBSAP implementation, including a technology needs assessment	
	Communication and outreach strategy for the NBSAP	
	Biodiversity finance and/or resource mobilization plan	
Institutional, monitoring and reporting	National Coordination Structures	
	Clearing-House Mechanism	
	Monitoring and Evaluation, and Reporting Plan	

Part 4. Evaluation of implementation

Does the NBSAP contain SMART targets and indicators that address all the Goals and Targets of the Kunming-Montreal Global Biodiversity Framework? This Table, and Part 5 below, could be completed by the review team, with support from the Secretariat to provide an initial record and assessment of progress with NBSAP implementation, using information derived from the CBD online reporting tool, the NBSAP, the latest national report and other documentation as relevant. The cells could be filled with just a Yes/No, Complete/Partial/Absent and/or reference to a page number.

Goal	Relevant National Target(s)	Associated Activities	Status of Implementation	Challenges
A- Protect and Restore				

B- Prosper with Nature				
C- Share Benefits Fairly				
D- Invest and Collaborate				

Global Target ¹³	Relevant National Target(s)	Associated Activities	Status of Implementation	Challenges
Target 1				
Target 2				
Target 3				
Target 4				
Target 5				
Target 6				
Target 7				
Target 8				
Target 9				
Target 10				
Target 11				
Target 12				
Target 13				
Target 14				
Target 15				
Target 16				
Target 17				
Target 18				
Target 19				
Target 20				
Target 21				
Target 22				
Target 23				

¹³ For more information on the KM-GBF Targets please see <https://www.cbd.int/gbf/targets>.

Does the NSBAP address the elements of Section C of the Kunming-Montreal Global Biodiversity Framework¹⁴?

Elements of section C	
A) Contribution and rights of indigenous peoples and local communities; B) Different value systems; C) Whole-of-government and whole-of-society approach; D) National circumstances, priorities and capabilities; E) Collective effort towards the targets; F) Right to development; G) Human rights-based approach; H) Gender; I) Fulfilment of the three objectives of the Convention and its Protocols and their balanced implementation; J) Consistency with international agreements or instruments; K) Principles of the Rio Declaration; L) science and innovation; M) Ecosystem approach; N) Intergenerational equity; O) Formal and informal education; P) Access to financial resources; Q) Cooperation and synergies; R) Biodiversity and health.	

Part 5: Mainstreaming and integration of biodiversity concerns

Are biodiversity concerns being effectively mainstreamed and integrated into relevant sectors? This section should be cross-checked with information provided in the table above.

Integration can be considered in terms of:

- Other sectors besides the environment, such as agriculture, fisheries, forestry, mining, finance, trade and industry, etc.;
- Other national and subnational programmes and strategies, including Poverty Reduction Strategy Papers, national reports on implementation of the Sustainable Development Goals, National Development Plans, National Plans to Combat Desertification, and others;
- Other convention processes besides the Convention on Biological Diversity, such as the other biodiversity-related conventions (CITES, CMS, Ramsar, WHC, the IPPC, the IWC and the ITPGRFA), the Rio conventions (UNCCD, UNFCCC) and others.

As in reviewing implementation, progress made in integration should be considered in terms of concrete outcomes for achieving the priorities of the national biodiversity strategy and action plan.

Sectoral Plan, Programme or Policy	Manner in which biodiversity is being integrated	Progress	Challenges	Person/s Responsible / Contact
Agriculture				
Fisheries and aquaculture				
Forestry				
Tourism				

¹⁴ For more information on each of the elements of section C please refer to <https://www.cbd.int/gbf/introduction>.

Energy and Mining				
Infrastructure				
Manufacturing and processing				
Health				
Other sectors				
Synergies with other Conventions*	Manner in which synergy is being achieved	Progress	Challenges	Person/s Responsible / Contact
CITES				
Ramsar				
CMS				
WHC				
ITPGRFA				
IWC				
IPPC				
UNFCCC				
UNCCD				

Part 6. Ways and means

A. Success stories and lessons learned

Does the revised NBSAP or NR contain any success stories and lessons learned in overcoming challenges to the development, implementation, cross-sectoral integration, evaluation and/or update of their national biodiversity strategies and action plans, which can benefit other Parties?

Specific mention of factors that facilitated NBSAP processes would be particularly useful. For example,

- Technical or financial support received;
- Political mandates and national priorities;
- Facilitating institutional and/or legal frameworks;
- Engagement of key sectors
- Engagement of stakeholders;
- Effectiveness of monitoring and reporting.

B. Needs for further support

In the light of the review information, what additional specific resources would be needed to overcome major challenges to implementation of the country's NBSAP, and challenges to the integration of biodiversity into other sectors. These needs might include, but need not be limited to, technical support from developed countries.

Appendix 3: Indicative checklist of documents which could be used for desk study

Document	Likely source
Latest national report	CBD website
Current NBSAP or Biodiversity Policy or equivalents	CBD website
These two documents provide the «backbone» for the desk study and could be used to identify a number of other relevant documents, which could include the following:	
Previous versions of NBSAP or equivalent; previous national reports	CBD website
Others, if any*	
National biodiversity management	
Government organigram	National government website; CBD NFP
Policy Framework for Environment, Biodiversity and relevant sectors	National government website; CBD NFP
Legislative Framework for Environment, Biodiversity and relevant sectors	National government website; CBD NFP
Biodiversity Governance Flowchart	CBD NFP
ToR and composition of National Biodiversity Council/Committee or equivalent	CBD NFP
Stakeholders of NBSAP process	NBSAP, CBD NFP
Others, if any*	
Evidence of implementation	
List of major biodiversity projects under implementation including GEF projects, etc.	GEF Sec website; CBD NFP
National Land Use Planning Policy and Maps	CBD NFP; Ministry of Planning
Protected area and other habitat maps	National CHM; WCMC-WCPA database
Species level monitoring information	National CHM
Others, if any*	
Evidence of Mainstreaming	

National constitution	National government website; CBD NFP
Relevant Sectoral Plans	National government website; CBD NFP

Document	Likely source
National economic and development plan, National Sustainable Development Strategy, Five or Ten-year Development Plan, etc.	National government website; CBD NFP
National Macro Planning Documents (national land use plan)	National government website; CBD NFP
Poverty Reduction Strategy, plans to meet the Sustainable Development Goals	National government website; CBD NFP
National education and social plan (including gender related plans)	Ministry of Education; CBD NFP
Relevant sector policies, strategies, plans (i.e. Wetland Policy, Forestry Policy, etc.)	CBD NFP
Decentralization plans	CBD NFP
Climate change adaptation and mitigation plans / Disaster Risk reduction plans	CBD NFP; Ministry of Environment
Trade policies	CBD NFP; Ministry of Trade
Others, if any*	
Finance and Resource mobilization	
General Budget Support arrangements (thematic and sector working groups, technical working group on budget, performance assessment framework).	CBD NFP; Ministry of Finance
UN Sustainable Development Cooperation Framework, International cooperation policies, Country Assistance Strategies/Plans,	UNDP Country Office; CBD NFP