



Convention on Biological Diversity

Distr.
GENERAL

UNEP/CBD/SBI/1/2/Add.1
25 February 2016

ORIGINAL: ENGLISH

SUBSIDIARY BODY ON IMPLEMENTATION

First meeting

Montreal, Canada, 2-6 May 2016

Item 4 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”. The majority (94 per cent) of Parties 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, calls on Parties to develop and adopt as a policy instrument and commence implementing an effective, participatory and updated NBSAP by 2015. Parties have also committed to establishing national targets, using the Strategic Plan and its Aichi Biodiversity Targets as a flexible framework.

3. In decision XI/2, the Conference of the Parties urged Parties and other Governments that had not yet done so to review and, as appropriate, update and revise, their NBSAPs in line with the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020, including national plans related to biodiversity and to report thereon to the Conference of the Parties at its twelfth meeting.

4. In decision XII/2, the twelfth meeting of the Conference of the Parties commended those countries that had reviewed and, as appropriate, updated and revised their NBSAPs in line with the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020, adopted relevant indicators and submitted their fifth national reports. The same decision also urged countries that had not yet fulfilled these commitments to do so no later than by October 2015.

5. The present note has been prepared by the Executive Secretary for the consideration of the first meeting of the Subsidiary Body on Implementation. It is updated from documents UNEP/CBD/COP/12/10/Rev.1 and UNEP/CBD/COP/12/INF/32 to reflect further national-level activities that have taken place since the earlier documents were prepared and/or that are currently under way,

* UNEP/CBD/SBI/1/1/Rev.1.

according to information provided by countries and using those NBSAPs which were received by the Secretariat, in a United Nations language, before 31 December 2015. Progress in the development or revision/updating of NBSAPs is summarized in section II of this document. 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.

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

6. Since 1993, 184 Parties have developed at least one NBSAP, while 12 Parties have yet to submit their first NBSAP. Of the 184 Parties that have prepared NBSAPs, 75 have revised them at least once.

7. 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, 141 have now accessed funds set-aside in GEF-5 and GEF-6 for Biodiversity Enabling Activities (49 through UNDP, 84 through UNEP, one through FAO, one through the Inter-American Development Bank (IADB), and six via Direct Access). The total investment in these revision projects to date is US\$ 31,231,908 of 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, notably the Government of Japan, through its Japan Biodiversity Fund, have provided additional support to the NBSAP revision process.

8. As of 31 December 2015, 67 Parties¹ have submitted to the Secretariat a NBSAP revised after the adoption of the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020. Of these 67 Parties, 55 submitted revised versions, 11 submitted their first NBSAP and 1 Party (Timor-Leste) submitted both its first NBSAP and a revised version. The current status of NBSAP preparation and revision, as reported informally to the Secretariat, is as follows:

NBSAP preparation and revision status as of 31 December 2015	
NBSAPs submitted to the Secretariat	67
NBSAPs completed but not submitted (pending final approval)	13
Will be submitted by March 2016 ²	72
Will be submitted by June 2016	10
Will be submitted by December 2016	18
Have not started yet	6
No plans to update NBSAP in the near future	6
No information	4
TOTAL	196

9. It is important to recognize that many of the NBSAPs finalized prior to the adoption of the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020 contain elements which are nonetheless in line with the Plan and form the basis of the progress reported in the fifth national reports.

¹ Afghanistan, Antigua and Barbuda, 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 COP-10), Austria, Belarus, Belgium, Bhutan, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cameroon, Colombia, Congo, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Denmark, Dominica, Dominican Republic, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Eritrea, Estonia, European Union, Finland, France, Georgia, Greece, Guatemala, Guyana, Hungary, India, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Jordan, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Netherlands, Niger, Nigeria, Niue, Peru, Poland, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Senegal, Serbia, Seychelles, Slovakia, Spain, Sudan, Suriname, Switzerland, Timor-Leste, Togo, Tuvalu, Uganda, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom, Venezuela, Viet Nam and Zambia.

² This category includes some Parties that communicated to the Secretariat or to their implementing agency that they would submit by December 2015 but did not.

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

10. 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 and the status and trends of biological diversity in the country and the 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 eleventh meeting of the Conference of the Parties. Very few Parties were able to do so by that time, but the number has increased since then.

11. The Secretariat has been compiling a database of all “targets”³ presented in NBSAPs, fifth national reports or separate documents submitted since the tenth meeting of the Conference of the Parties. As of 31 December 2015, the database contains 2,229 separate “targets” and the number will continue to increase as more Parties submit revised NBSAPs. Wherever national targets have been mapped to the global targets by the Party concerned, this is represented in the database. To date, 50 Parties⁴ have done so. Further analysis of national targets is provided in the analysis of the contribution of targets established by Parties and progress towards the Aichi Biodiversity Targets (UNEP/SBI/1/2.Add.2).

12. Once launched, the online reporting tool will provide a mechanism through which Parties can provide updated information on their national targets and on progress towards the Aichi Biodiversity Targets.

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

13. This section presents key findings from an internal analysis of 64 NBSAPs submitted to the Secretariat between the adoption of the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020 and the 31 December 2015.⁵ This analysis is based on the NBSAP guidance adopted in decision IX/8 and considers 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 each category and subcategory of the analysis.

A. Basic information

14. NBSAPs have been submitted to the Secretariat in various forms. While 48 of the documents⁶ are national biodiversity strategies and action plans, 14 are strategy or policy documents.⁷ Seven of the Parties⁸ that have submitted these strategy documents are currently developing action plans. For the

³ 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”, “work area”, etc.

⁴ Afghanistan, Antigua and Barbuda, Belarus, Belgium, Bhutan, Botswana, Brazil, Cambodia, Cameroon, Canada, Côte d’Ivoire, Denmark, France, Georgia, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, India, Iraq, Ireland, Japan, Kiribati, Lebanon, Luxembourg, Mongolia, Morocco, Namibia, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Peru, Republic of Korea, Rwanda, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Seychelles, Slovakia, Slovenia, Solomon Islands, South Africa, Sudan, Sweden, Switzerland, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Timor-Leste, Togo, Uganda, United Kingdom, and Viet Nam.

⁵ This analysis will be updated to include NBSAPs received after 31 December 2015 for the thirteenth meeting of the Conference of the Parties.

⁶ Afghanistan, Antigua and Barbuda, Australia, Austria, Bhutan, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cameroon, Congo, Dominica, Dominican Republic, Democratic People’s Republic of Korea, Equatorial Guinea, Eritrea, Estonia, European Union, Georgia, Greece, Guatemala, Guyana, India (Action Plan only), Ireland, Italy, Japan, Jordan, Liechtenstein, Mali, Malta, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Niger, Nigeria, Niue, Peru, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Senegal, Serbia, Seychelles, Spain, Sudan, Suriname (Action Plan only), Timor-Leste, Togo, Tuvalu, Uganda, Zambia.

⁷ Belarus, Belgium, Colombia, Denmark, El Salvador, Finland, France, Mauritania, Netherlands, Slovakia, Switzerland, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom and Venezuela.

⁸ Belarus, Colombia, El Salvador, Finland, Slovakia, Venezuela and Switzerland.

purpose of this analysis, all of these documents are considered NBSAPs and the Secretariat refers to them as such.

15. The timelines of the NBSAPs submitted to date also vary. While 9 NBSAPs⁹ cover periods between 2015 and 2018, 38 cover periods up to 2020¹⁰ and 9 others cover periods up to 2030.¹¹

Adoption as policy instrument

16. The text of 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 society and decision-making. The actual implications of adoption as a policy instrument will vary from country to country and by level of adoption and it is still too early to assess if and to what extent, adoption as a policy instrument has indeed resulted in mainstreaming of biodiversity into sectoral and cross sectoral policy and practice. In the meantime, 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, cabinet, councils of ministers etc. Other Parties have kept this adoption strictly in the realm of the environment sector. Still others have made their NBSAP guiding frameworks without necessarily imparting this role with legal power. Some examples follow.

17. A total of 23 NBSAPs¹² have been adopted as “whole-of-government” instruments. For example:

- (a) The NBSAP of Spain has been adopted by royal decree;
- (b) The NBSAPs of India, Georgia, Guyana, Japan, Myanmar, Nepal, Seychelles and Tuvalu, were adopted/endorsed by Cabinet;
- (c) The Council of Ministers of Belarus, Greece, Mauritania and Sudan approved their NBSAP.

18. Another four NBSAPs¹³ have been adopted as instruments applying to the environment sector:

- (a) The Biodiversity Conservation Strategy of Australia was adopted by the Government and it functions as a policy “umbrella” over other more specific environmental national frameworks. It is also a guiding policy framework for the diverse mix of Australian, state, territory and local government and private sector approaches to biodiversity conservation;
- (b) Dominican Republic – The resolution approving the NBSAP as a public policy for the environment sector, instructs the Ministry of Environment and Natural Resources to incorporate the strategy in all its plans, projects and planned activities;
- (c) Guatemala – The Council of Protected Areas approves the NBSAP as a Resolution with instructions to use it as a policy instrument to implement the National Biodiversity Policy of Guatemala.

19. Another five NBSAPs¹⁴ serve as guidance or framework documents:

- (a) The NBSAP of Belgium offers a framework in terms of the policy to follow and the subsequent implementing actions to be developed;

⁹ Afghanistan (2014-2017), Burkina Faso (Action Plan 2015), Ireland (2016), Peru (2018), Republic of Korea (2018), Serbia (2018), Spain (2017), Suriname (2016), and Tuvalu (2016).

¹⁰ Antigua and Barbuda, Austria, Belarus, Belgium, Burundi, Cameroon, Dominica, Dominican Republic, Eritrea, Estonia, European Union, Finland, France, Georgia, Guyana, India, Italy, Japan, Jordan, Liechtenstein, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Nepal, Netherlands, Niger, Nigeria, Republic of Moldova, Senegal, Seychelles, Slovakia, Sudan, Switzerland, Timor-Leste, Togo, United Kingdom, Venezuela and Viet Nam.

¹¹ Australia (2030), Congo (2030), Greece (2029), Guatemala (2022), Mongolia (2025), Namibia (2022), Uganda (2025), United Arab Emirates (2021), Zambia (2025).

¹² Belarus, Colombia, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, Georgia, Greece, Guyana, India, Japan, Malta, Mongolia, Myanmar, Nepal, Netherlands, Peru, Republic of Moldova, Serbia, Seychelles, Spain, Sudan, Switzerland and Tuvalu.

¹³ Australia, Bhutan, Dominican Republic and Guatemala.

¹⁴ Belgium, El Salvador, Mali, Republic of Korea and Timor-Leste.

(b) The NBSAP of the Republic of Korea is considered a comprehensive framework for achieving the nation's goals to conserve the biodiversity of Korea for the coming five years;

(c) The NBSAP of Timor-Leste is a guiding policy framework for district and sub-district authorities, civil society and the private sector in their approaches to biodiversity conservation and ecosystems management.

20. The remaining 26 NBSAPs¹⁵ do not provide sufficient information to know if they have been adopted as a policy instrument, or, if they have been, what type of instruments they are.

B. Revision process

1. Assessment of previous NBSAP

21. Of the Parties that have submitted a post 2010 NBSAP, 34¹⁶ mention having done an assessment¹⁷ 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 subjects covered in these assessments vary from country to country. Some assess the proportion of the NBSAP activities that have been implemented, the effectiveness of targets and of the NBSAP itself as monitoring instruments, the level of stakeholder engagement and awareness, the levels of funding achieved for implementation etc. Some examples follow:

(a) Australia assessed the 1996 NBSAP and the National Objectives and Targets (2001-2005), some of the results were: (a) the NBSAP is relevant to the national biodiversity conservation policy; (b) there is consistency between the strategy and subnational biodiversity strategies; (c) the National Objectives and Targets are a useful record of national biodiversity conservation priorities and policy directions but need to be more specific; (d) public awareness of the NBSAP and the Targets was low; (e) a revised strategy should contain measurable targets;

(b) In Cameroon, the assessment of the national implementation of its 2000 NBSAP highlighted that the strategy served as an effective platform for monitoring national progress and reporting under its commitments to the Convention, however it highlighted a weak appropriation of the document by key stakeholders;

(c) In Dominica, 30 per cent of the objectives of the NBSAP 2011-2005 were achieved. Between 2005 and 2013, national consciousness of biodiversity increased and 60 per cent of the expected results were achieved;

(d) Equatorial Guinea made an assessment of the previous NBSAP, even though it was never implemented due to lack of funding. The results of this analysis were taken into account for the revised NBSAP, some of these are: (a) the approaches and principles were ambiguous; (b) the Strategy did not have institutional support and (c) there were not any objectives or actions for the forest sector;

(e) France had several assessments: (a) an internal analysis by the focal points; (b) a report on the governance of the NBSAP (c) an external assessment by «Inspection générale de l'administration» (General administration inspection); (d) and a joint report by the Council for Food, Agriculture and Rural Areas and the Council for the Environment and Sustainable Development, called "The National Biodiversity Strategy: assessment and perspectives, June 2010".

¹⁵ Austria, Burkina Faso, Cameroon, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Dominica, Equatorial Guinea, Eritrea, European Union, France, Ireland, Italy, Liechtenstein, Namibia, Nepal, Niger, Nigeria, Niue, Senegal, Slovakia, Suriname, Togo, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom, Venezuela, Viet Nam and Zambia.

¹⁶ Antigua and Barbuda, Australia, Belgium, Bhutan, Burundi, Cameroon, Colombia, Congo, Dominica, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Equatorial Guinea, France, Georgia, India, Ireland, Japan, Jordan, Mauritania, Mongolia, Namibia, Nepal, Nigeria, Niue, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Senegal, Seychelles, Slovakia, Suriname, Togo, Viet Nam, Uganda, United Kingdom, Zambia.

¹⁷ This includes assessments of implementation of relevance to the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020, among others.

(f) In Jordan, previous NBSAP indicated that more than 50 per cent of the projects were implemented by 2014. The revised NBSAP addresses the shortcomings of the previous NBSAP by seeking to adopt a financing framework using internal, external and innovative funding sources; a national outreach and awareness-raising programme; a national-capacity-building programme; a revised governance framework for implementation and its monitoring; improving capabilities for inter-institutional coordination, national mainstreaming and knowledge management; among other matters;

(g) The assessment in Namibia showed that 80 per cent of the targets of the previous NBSAP were at least partially achieved and its implementation led to the proclamation of new protected areas, a first marine protected area and the proclamation of 32 community forests. To address the low awareness of biodiversity, shown in the results of the assessment, a CEPA strategy was elaborated as part of the revised NBSAP;

(h) The NBSAP assessment of Senegal describes achievements in relation to protected areas, the creation of new sites, enhancement of the management of the sites, the creation of management plans and the enhancement of the involvement of the private sector and local communities in managing biodiversity;

(i) The first NBSAP of the Seychelles was considered particularly successful in mobilizing biodiversity stakeholders, identifying priorities and providing civil society with a framework for engagement which has contributed to the emergence of a dynamic and effective biodiversity NGO sector;

(j) Uganda took the results of the revision into account, by making the clearing-house mechanism (CHM) operational and has put in place measures to significantly increase the resources for biodiversity conservation by exploring various sources of innovative sustainable funding mechanisms;

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 and the implications for the implementation of the NBSAP. The government ministries that were most commonly involved were: Agriculture, Fisheries, Forestry, Education, Development/Planning and Trade and Industry. Other Ministries involved included: Economy, Finance, Infrastructure/Transport, Culture, Tourism, Science and Technology, Social Affairs, Health and Sports (see table 1).

23. Parties also reported the involvement of other stakeholders in the revision process. These include indigenous and local communities (reported in 16 NBSAPs¹⁸), NGOs/Civil Society (36 NBSAPs¹⁹), private sector (18 NBSAPs²⁰) and Academia (23 NBSAPs²¹).

24. Of the 64 NBSAPs reviewed, 41 record having a formal coordination structure, or a working group for NBSAP related tasks, composed of different stakeholders.²² The role of these coordination mechanisms vary. For example:

(a) The committees/working groups of Ireland, Japan, Nigeria, Senegal and Timor-Leste were/are responsible for reviewing/updating, monitoring and for overseeing implementation;

¹⁸ Burundi, Cameroon, Colombia, Guatemala, Guyana, Ireland, Japan, Namibia, Niue, Peru, Senegal, Suriname, Togo, Uganda, Venezuela, Zambia.

¹⁹ Afghanistan, Antigua and Barbuda, Belarus, Belgium, Bhutan, Burundi, Cameroon, Colombia, Congo, Dominica, Dominican Republic, Equatorial Guinea, Eritrea, Estonia, France, Georgia, Greece, Guatemala, Guyana, Japan, Liechtenstein, Mongolia, Myanmar, Namibia, Nigeria, Niue, Peru, Senegal, Serbia, Seychelles, Spain, Sudan, Timor-Leste, Togo, Uganda, Zambia.

²⁰ Cameroon, Colombia, Congo, Dominica, Dominican Republic, Estonia, Georgia, Guatemala, Guyana, Japan, Namibia, Niue, Peru, Spain, Sudan, Switzerland, Togo, Uganda.

²¹ Afghanistan, Colombia, Dominican Republic, Equatorial Guinea, Eritrea, Estonia, France, Georgia, Guatemala, Japan, Jordan, Mongolia, Myanmar, Namibia, Nigeria, Senegal, Serbia, Seychelles, Spain, Timor-Leste, Togo, Uganda and Zambia.

²² Afghanistan, Antigua and Barbuda, Austria, Australia, Belarus, Belgium, Bhutan, Burkina Faso, Cameroon, Colombia, Congo, Dominican Republic, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Eritrea, Estonia, France, Ireland, Georgia, Greece, Guatemala, India, Japan, Jordan, Mali, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Netherlands, Nigeria, Peru, Senegal, Serbia, Seychelles, Sudan, Timor-Leste, Togo, Uganda, Venezuela, Viet Nam and Zambia.

(b) The committees/working groups of Antigua and Barbuda, Austria and Bhutan were/are responsible for the preparation of the NBSAP but will also take part in the implementation process;

(c) The committees/working groups of Belgium, Dominican Republic, France, Mali, Seychelles, besides being responsible for reviewing/updating, they will play a role after NBSAP adoption, for monitoring;

(d) Mali, Malta, Seychelles and Suriname are considering establishing formal coordination mechanisms responsible for implementation. Other Parties mention different stakeholders responsible or otherwise involved in implementation of their strategy; however, there is no indication of how they are coordinated or structured.

Table 1. Number of Parties reporting the involvement and roles of other ministries in NBSAP process

Involvement	Agri-culture	Fisheries	Forestry	Dev. Planning	Education	Finance	Culture	Trade & Industry	Economy	Tourism	Science & Tech	Sports	Infrast/Transport	Social affairs	Health
on committee	20	13	10	12	9	8	7	8	6	7	6	4	5	4	3
consulted	9	4	10	3	8	7	3	2	2	6	4	1	2	0	4
will implement	4	1	4	3	0	1	0	4	0	2	2	1	2	2	2

3. Clearing-house mechanism

25. Of the 64 NBSAPs reviewed, only four reported having used their national clearing-house mechanism in the revision process.²³

26. The Secretariat is aware of a total of 40 countries²⁴ that have a national clearing-house mechanism or similar; 17²⁵ revised NBSAPs mention their intention to improve and enhance their current system. Of the rest, 14²⁶ have actions and/or plans to establish a national clearing-house mechanism. The remaining nine do not mention any action on the elaboration maintenance or enhancement of a national CHM.

C. Components

1. Resource mobilization strategies

27. Decision XI/14 paragraph 25, encourages 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, nine NBSAPs specifically contain a national resource mobilization strategy or equivalent; these are: Belgium, Burundi, Guyana, Mali, Mauritania, Niger, Nigeria, Niue and Timor-Leste. A total of 20 Parties have costed their action plans taking an

²³ Belgium, European Union, Japan and Niger.

²⁴ Australia, Austria, Belarus, Belgium, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cameroon, Colombia, Congo, Denmark, Dominican Republic, El Salvador, Estonia, European Union, Finland, France, Georgia, Guatemala, India, Italy, Japan, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Netherlands, Niger, Nigeria, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Senegal, Serbia, Seychelles, Slovakia, Spain, Switzerland, Togo, Uganda, United Kingdom, Venezuela and Zambia.

²⁵ Australia, Belgium, Burundi, Cameroon, Colombia, European Union, Georgia, Guatemala, Italy, Japan, Mali, Malta, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Togo, United Kingdom of and Venezuela.

²⁶ Antigua and Barbuda, Dominica, Democratic People’s Republic of Korea, Equatorial Guinea, Guyana, Jordan, Mongolia, Myanmar, Nepal, Niue, Peru, Sudan, Timor-Leste and United Arab Emirates.

important step towards the elaboration of a resource mobilization strategy.²⁷ A total of 41 Parties explain in their NBSAPs efforts that have been put in place to increase financing for biodiversity in their countries or express an intention to develop resource mobilization plans.²⁸ A total of 30 Parties have set national targets in line with Aichi Biodiversity Target 20.²⁹ Some examples follow:

(a) Antigua and Barbuda has put in place the Sustainable Island Resource Fund (SIRF), a self-sustaining non-profit entity that will earn revenue and attract funding to care for the protected areas and reduce fossil fuel consumption. The fund will operate with limited or no central government financial support; Guyana and the Republic of Korea also intend to create specific funds for financing biodiversity activities;

(b) Bhutan - National Target 20 - “By 2016, the funding requirement for the implementation of the NBSAP is identified and funds mobilized”;

(c) Dominican Republic - National Target 20: “By 2016, a national financing campaign for supporting NBSAP implementation, with a view to achieving the goals of the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity (2011-2020), has been undertaken”;

(d) The United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland has a priority action to “Develop new and innovative financing mechanisms to direct more funding towards the achievement of biodiversity outcomes” and has set various activities under this action;

(e) The NBSAP of the European Union (Target 6, action 18) makes reference to the mobilization of additional resources, stating that the Commission and Member States will contribute their fair share to international efforts to significantly increase resources for global biodiversity;

(f) The NBSAP of the European Union also mentions that the Commission and Member States will work to diversify and scale up various sources of funding, by promoting the development and use of innovative financing mechanisms, including market based instruments. In addition, the Commission and the European Investment Bank are exploring the possibility to use Public Private Partnerships and to establish a biodiversity financing facility;

(g) Japan - Target E-2 “...Effectively and efficiently mobilize the resources (funds, human resources, technologies, etc.) needed to achieve the Aichi Biodiversity Targets by 2020 at the latest”;

(h) National Target 17 of Namibia aims that “By 2022, mobilization of financial resources from all sources has been increased compared to the period 2008-2012 to allow for the effective implementation of this strategy and action plan”; the key performance indicators for this target are: (i) volume of domestic funding per annum; (ii) increase in the number of sources (including private sector); and (iii) volume of Official Development Assistance (multi-lateral and bi-lateral);

(i) Nigeria - Target 13 “By 2020, national-based funding for biodiversity is increased by 25 per cent, with effective international partnership support”;

(j) Peru is currently developing a resource mobilization strategy up to 2018 to implement the NBSAP, which includes Public Investment Projects (PIP) and financing from regional governments, the private sector and other cooperation mechanisms;

(k) The NBSAP of Senegal mentions that several financial instruments will be issued to finance its implementation: Payment for Ecosystem Services, fiscal instruments, corporate social responsibility and fiduciary funds;

²⁷ Bhutan, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Dominica, Eritrea, Estonia, Guatemala, India, Mali, Mauritania, Namibia, Nepal, Niger, Republic of Moldova, Senegal, Sudan, Suriname, Spain, Togo and Uganda.

²⁸ Antigua and Barbuda, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Belarus, Bhutan, Cameroon, Colombia, Denmark, Dominica, Dominican Republic, Estonia, European Union, Finland, France, Guatemala, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Jordan, Malta, Netherlands, Niger, Niue, Peru, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Senegal, Serbia, Seychelles, Slovakia, Spain, Suriname, Switzerland, Togo, Timor-Leste, Tuvalu, Uganda, United Kingdom, Viet Nam and Zambia.

²⁹ Afghanistan, Antigua and Barbuda, Belarus, Belgium, Bhutan, Burundi, Cameroon, Congo, Dominican Republic, Equatorial Guinea, Eritrea, European Union, Finland, Georgia, Greece, Guyana, India, Jordan, Japan, Mali, Mauritania, Mongolia, Namibia, Nigeria, Niue, Republic of Korea, Serbia, Uganda, United Arab Emirates and Zambia.

(l) Serbia - Objective 4.4: Strengthen and expand financing for biodiversity conservation and provide incentives for biodiversity conservation within all sectors; Objective 11.1: Ensure a diverse portfolio of sources and strategies for the long-term funding of the Strategy. Ensure that the costs of biological diversity conservation are shared equitably among institutions and stakeholders so that they reflect contributions to degradation and benefits from protection or use;

(m) Seychelles will use the Public Sector Investment Programme (PSIP) as a planning tool available to the Government to outline its ongoing and future development priorities. In addition, two projects are planned: “Payment for Ecosystems Services” with the objective to identify means of raising fees for ecosystems services currently treated as free and the “Seychelles Protected Area Finance Project”, to ensure sustainable financing of protected areas;

(n) Uganda has set three national targets in relation to Aichi Target 20: (i) “By 2015, a study is undertaken in respect of CBD decision X/3 and guidelines for financing biodiversity in Uganda developed”; (ii) “By 2017, finance resources for effectively implementing NBSAP2 is increased by at least 10 per cent from the current level”; (iii) “By 2018, new financing mechanisms are operational and new funding mobilized for biodiversity conservation”.

2. *Communication, education and public awareness*

28. Decisions VIII/6 and IX/8 state that communication, education and public awareness strategies activities should be integral parts of NBSAPs. Of the 64 post Nagoya NBSAP, 12³⁰ contain a CEPA strategy and action plan or equivalent and 42³¹ have initiatives relating to communication, education and public awareness. Some examples follow:

(a) Mauritania’s Awareness and Communication Strategy includes several activities, among these are: (i) conduct awareness and informative campaigns; (ii) create regional and local committees on biodiversity; (iii) disseminate good community practices of sustainable management of biodiversity; (iv) strengthen technical and operational capacities of community organizations contributing to the conservation of biodiversity;

(b) Nepal has a Communication, Extension and Outreach Implementation Action Plan with actions, target audiences and lead roles. In addition, the NBSAP identifies the expected outcomes for each of the key target audiences, the messages to be communicated, as well as the tools and platforms to be used;

(c) The Communication and Awareness Mechanisms of Niger cover the communication constraints in the country, actions to be taken and communication channels;

(d) Northern Ireland (United Kingdom) established “The Eco Schools Programme”, a programme of environmental education where children undertake practical projects and learn about the issues affecting biodiversity both locally and globally. It also has an objective to increase awareness and appreciation of biodiversity and ecosystem services. It showcases various campaigns and programs such as “Notice Nature” and “Green Schools” and has a section on future actions and activities, along with indicators and expected outcomes;

(e) Scotland (United Kingdom), has several programmes, such as the “Teaching in Nature” which takes learning outdoors, the “Simple Pleasures Easily Found” campaign which encourages people to explore and enjoy their local green space and path networks and the ‘citizen science’ initiative that aims to increase participation in voluntary biological recording;

(f) The Awareness, Communication and Outreach Strategy of Sudan identifies actions, messages, target groups, communication tools and actors. The strategy aims to support the actions taken to address priority issues in the revised NBSAP;

³⁰ Burundi, Guatemala, Guyana, Mauritania, Namibia, Nepal, Niger, Nigeria, Niue, Senegal, Sudan and Timor-Leste.

³¹ Antigua and Barbuda, Austria, Belarus, Belgium, Bhutan, Burundi, Congo, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Equatorial Guinea, Eritrea, Estonia, Georgia, Greece, Guyana, Japan, India, Ireland, Italy, Jordan, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Namibia, Nigeria, Niue, Peru, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Senegal, Serbia, Slovakia, Spain, Sudan, Togo, Timor-Leste, Uganda, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom, Venezuela, Viet Nam and Zambia.

29. National targets and/or objectives set in relation to Aichi Biodiversity Target 1:

(a) One of the Objectives of the NBSAP of Belgium is to involve the community through communication, education, public awareness and training. More specifically the objective: (i) strives to include biodiversity and its ecosystem services in education programs; (ii) promotes understanding of the importance of biodiversity; and (iii) raises awareness among and provide thematic training courses for the sectors that impact biodiversity;

(b) National Target 1 of Bhutan aspires that: “By 2018, at least 60 per cent of the population aware of values of biodiversity and steps they can take to conserve and use it sustainably”. The target includes several activities and indicators. Burundi, Congo, Eritrea, Georgia, Malta set similar national targets in this regard;

(c) The NBSAP of Estonia has three overarching goals, the first of which aspires that by 2020 “People are familiar with, appreciate and conserve nature and know how to use their knowledge in their everyday lives”;

(d) Japan set a National Target mapped to Aichi Target 1: “Achieving the mainstreaming of biodiversity across society”, enhancing publicity, education and public awareness on biodiversity;

(e) National Target 1 of Nigeria states that “By 2020, 30 per cent of Nigeria’s population is aware of the importance of biodiversity to the ecology and economy of the country”;

(f) Peru set National Target 6 which says that by 2021, awareness and appreciation of biodiversity is increased in the population by 20 per cent;

(g) Serbia proposes a wide range of activities to increase public awareness: develop and implement modules, campaigns, web portals to raise public awareness, academic programmes and courses, communication systems and training;

(h) Uganda has set four national targets in relation to Aichi Target 1: (i) “By 2018, at the latest, people are aware of the meaning and values of biodiversity conservation and the steps they can take to use it sustainably”; (ii) “By 2020, at the latest, students and teaching staff are aware of the value of biodiversity conservation and its sustainable use”; (iii) “By 2020, international cooperation and networking is effective enough to enhance communication of the value of biodiversity conservation and sustainable use”; and (iv) “By 2018, Public Awareness, Education and Participation in Biotechnology and Biosafety are enhanced”.

3. Capacity development

30. Seven NBSAPs, those of Burundi, Guyana, Mali, Nigeria, Niue, Suriname and Timor-Leste, include a national capacity development plan; some examples of these plans are presented below. In addition, 33 other countries³² list several capacity-building activities, some of which also indicate the budget allocated as well as the entity in charge of the activity:

(a) Burundi developed a Capacity Building Strategic Plan for biodiversity 2013-2020, with the objective to increase capacity at three different levels: individual, organizational and system levels;

(b) Guyana prepared a needs assessment and a Capacity Development Plan, which includes a list of priority actions, implementation agency, timeframe, partners and recommendations;

(c) The Action Plan to reinforce national capacities for the conservation of biodiversity of Mali covers six different axes, with actions, timeframe, indicators and responsible agencies. The axes are: (i) improve the mobilization of actors; (ii) adopt tools, technologies and approaches for the sustainable management of the environment; (iii) improve structures and institutions responsible for managing environmental issues; (iv) adopt a legal framework conducive to the sustainable management of the

³² Austria, Burkina Faso, Cameroon, Congo, Dominica, Eritrea, Georgia, Greece, Guatemala, Guyana, India, Japan, Jordan, Liechtenstein, Mali, Mauritania, Myanmar, Namibia, Niger, Peru, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Nepal, Senegal, Serbia, Seychelles, Slovakia, Sudan, Togo, Tuvalu, Uganda, United Kingdom and Zambia.

environment; (v) strengthen monitoring and analysis; and (vi) improve mainstreaming in development planning;

(d) 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;

(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;

(f) The Capacity Development Plan for Biodiversity of Timor-Leste aims to ensure effective management and conservation of biodiversity (at the levels of ecosystems, species and genetic variability). The priority training areas are: awareness and education, biodiversity project planning, managing effectiveness assessments, protected area policy planning and management, enforcement and ecosystem assessment.

D. Mainstreaming

1. Valuation of biodiversity and ecosystem services

31. A total of 15 Parties³³ report having conducted valuation studies of the biodiversity in their countries, or parts thereof. There is not enough information however to determine if the results from these exercises have been significantly considered in setting priorities, mainstreaming and/or developing the revised NBSAP. Some examples of valuation studies conducted include:

(a) Bhutan recently undertook a preliminary study, estimating the total ecosystem service mean value per year, identifying the leading contributor in terms of essential ecosystems services, as well as those who benefit in Bhutan and outside of the country;

(b) Colombia conducted some pilot valuation studies and has also started to assess other (non-economic) values of biodiversity; neither has yet been used in decision-making;

(c) In 2014, a project was initiated to map Danish nature and to begin the process of assessing its status and economic value. The project represents the response of Denmark to the EU Biodiversity Strategy, which recommends that each Member State prepare an inventory, assessment and valuation of its nature before 2020;

(d) The European Union has considered studies undertaken by TEEB and by FAO concerning values of biodiversity, as a basis to develop NBSAP;

(e) Georgia has recently completed a pilot country project for a scoping valuation study of ecosystems and biodiversity which is now being implemented under the TEEB initiative;

(f) Malta documented the results of the existing biodiversity valuation in the ‘Malta State of the Environment Report’ issued by the Malta Environment and Planning Authority;

(g) The Republic of Moldova carried out a valuation study in 2013: ‘National biodiversity planning for supporting the enforcement of the CBD Strategic plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020 in the Republic of Moldova’. The study provided economic values for different sectors: agriculture, forestry and hunting, water management, fishery, tourism and leisure, mitigating the effects of natural disasters;

(h) The Seychelles carried out an overarching study of the value of biodiversity in 2005 and currently there is an ongoing project called ‘Seychelles Biodiversity and Ecosystems Services Valuation’

³³ Bhutan, Colombia, Denmark, El Salvador, European Union, Georgia, Guyana, Japan, Malta, Mongolia, Netherlands, Republic of Moldova, Seychelles, Uganda and Viet Nam.

with the objective to model and extrapolate biodiversity and ecosystem services value for the country, incorporate results into national accounting and establish basic valuation capacity within key agencies;

(i) Some examples of valuation exercise for a specific area are (i) the economic valuation study that El Salvador conducted in La Union bay, to evaluate the profitability of salt pans and shrimp production; (ii) the “Economic value of the Tuul River headwater area ecosystem of Mongolia”; (iii) the valuation study of Uganda for the Nakivubo urban wetland in Kampala; and (iv) the project of Viet Nam to assess the value of the natural goods and services of Bidoup-Nui BaNP in Lam Dong Province.

32. Of the 64 NBSAPs reviewed, 30 state the intention of conducting valuation studies in the future.³⁴ For example:

(a) Belarus, Estonia and Italy have the development of tools and methods for the valuation of biodiversity and ecosystem services as part of their action plans. In addition, Belgium is currently developing methodologies to value biodiversity and ecosystem services, including the ecological aspects related to ecosystem structure and functions, the socioeconomic aspects and the monetary aspects;

(b) One of the activities of National Target 11 in Equatorial Guinea is to undertake valuation studies of degradation areas;

(c) Guatemala will carry out economic valuation studies of damaged ecosystems and ecosystems in need of restoration; and will also generate mechanisms to disseminate the results;

(d) Ireland will carry out further and more detailed research on the economic value of ecosystems and biodiversity with a view to integrate economic values into national accounting processes;

(e) Nepal plans to initiate TEEB studies for forest, mountains, wetlands and agriculture sectors. In addition, it intends to develop a system for economic valuation of ecosystem services provided by the country’s protected areas;

(f) Nigeria is planning to undertake an Economic Valuation study on Biodiversity, as well as national studies on “The Economics of Ecosystems and Biodiversity” TEEB;

(g) Suriname has assigned high priority to determining the current and potential value of forest biodiversity and intends to conduct studies in this regard in the short term (1-2 years).

33. Another 24 countries³⁵ have set national targets on valuation. For example:

(a) Belarus - National Target 2 - “To develop and use the techniques of estimation of the cost value of biodiversity and ecosystem services and integrate them into projects of concepts, forecasts, programs, schemes of sectoral development, which realization is connected with biodiversity use and (or) could influence it”;

(b) Cameroon - Target 14: “By 2020, the development and implementation of a comprehensive programme for the valuation of biodiversity should have been realised and payments for ecosystem services and goods imputed into the national budget for use in promoting sustainable biological and genetic resources”;

(c) Greece - General National Target 13 states: “Gaining appreciation of ecosystem services and the promotion of the value of Greek biodiversity”. This target has two specific targets: (i) the valuation of ecosystem functions and services in social and economic terms and (ii) the promotion of the value of biodiversity and the services provided by biodiversity and ecosystems;

³⁴ Antigua and Barbuda, Belarus, Belgium, Burundi, Cameroon, Dominica, Dominican Republic, Equatorial Guinea, Estonia, France, Guatemala, India, Japan, Jordan, Ireland, Italy, Malta, Namibia, Nepal, Niger, Nigeria, Peru, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Slovakia, Suriname, Timor-Leste, Togo, Tuvalu and Zambia.

³⁵ Antigua and Barbuda, Belarus, Belgium, Bhutan, Burundi, Cameroon, Congo, Dominican Republic, Equatorial Guinea, Estonia, Georgia, Greece, Guatemala, India, Japan, Jordan, Mali, Mauritania, Namibia, Nigeria, Peru, Senegal, Switzerland and Uganda.

(d) Guatemala - Target 2: “By 2015, valuation mechanisms for biodiversity and ecosystem services will be implanted considering valuation as a national priority for integral intergenerational human development”;

(e) Switzerland - Strategic Goal 6: “By 2020, ecosystem services are recorded quantitatively. This enables their consideration in the measurement of welfare as complementary indicators to gross domestic product and in regulatory impact assessments.”

2. National development plans

34. A total of 17 Parties³⁶ demonstrate that biodiversity has been integrated into their national development plan or equivalent instrument:

(a) Biodiversity figures prominently in the eleventh Five Year Plan of Bhutan (2013-2018);

(b) The NBSAP of the Dominican Republic is linked to the implementation of its National Development Strategy (2010-2030). Actions relating to biodiversity under its strategic objective on sustainable natural resource management are to be carried out by 2016;

(c) The government coalition programme of Estonia has set the objective of developing a responsible attitude towards nature in people and maintaining a clean and biologically diverse living environment supporting the sustainability of the nation;

(d) The Plan de développement économique et social (PDES) 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;

(e) The Plan Bicentenario of Peru “El Perú hacia el 2021” recognizes and positions biodiversity conservation as a national objective;

(f) The National Strategic Development Plan (SDP) of Timor Leste commits to meeting several of the Aichi Biodiversity Targets;

35. The NBSAPs of nine other Parties³⁷ contain elements and/or targets and actions, which aim at mainstreaming with the national development plan or equivalent instrument.

3. Sustainable development plans

36. Of the 64 NBSAPs reviewed, 12 Parties³⁸ 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 European Union intends to use some of its sustainable development and agro-environmental indicators to monitor and report on progress implementing its NBSAP;

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

(d) The NBSAP of Niger is part of one of six programmes comprising the National Plan for the Environment for Sustainable Development.

4. Poverty eradication

37. A total of 21 Parties’ post Nagoya NBSAPs³⁹ mention links to poverty eradication and/or integrate this objective into their principles, targets and/or actions. For example:

³⁶ Bhutan, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Dominican Republic, Equatorial Guinea, Estonia, Namibia, Netherlands, Niger, Niue, Northern Ireland, Peru, Slovakia, Timor-Leste, Uganda, Venezuela and Viet Nam.

³⁷ France, Belgium, Cameroon, Ireland, Finland, Colombia, Nigeria, United Kingdom and Zambia.

³⁸ Belgium, European Union, Estonia, France, Ireland, Mauritania, Myanmar, Niger, Serbia, Seychelles, Switzerland and Timor-Leste.

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

(b) Burkina Faso, Burundi, Congo, Niger, Equatorial Guinea's Poverty Reduction Strategies or equivalents integrate biodiversity considerations;

(c) Afghanistan, Moldova, Namibia, Niger and Peru's NBSAPs aim to implement biodiversity actions in order to contribute to poverty alleviation. Namibia's NBSAP, through its CBNRM Programme, monitors the role biodiversity plays in poverty alleviation in rural areas.

(d) 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.

5. Subnational level plans

38. Nine Parties' post Nagoya NBSAPs⁴⁰ mention that their country either already has subnational biodiversity plans or has started or intends on preparing subnational biodiversity strategies and actions plans. For example:

(a) Austria has Action Plans for each of the federal provinces which describe the implementation measures. These plans are reviewed and updated every five years;

(b) The NBSAP of Nepal presents a framework for Local Biodiversity Strategy and Action Plan (LBSAP) to guide local authorities in developing detailed and specific LBSAPs. The framework also outlines monitoring and funding mechanisms for these subnational plans;

(c) In the Republic of Korea, Gyeongsangnam-do Province and Gangwon-do Province adopted biodiversity strategies in 2013 and 2014, respectively;

(d) In Nigeria, a memorandum was adopted by the National Council on Environment on the need for subnational (state and local) authorities to prepare and implement Subnational BSAPs. Since then some States have complied.

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

40. The Secretariat is aware of 19 Parties (including the above mentioned 6) that have at least one subnational biodiversity action plan⁴¹ however not all of these are reflected in the revised NBSAPs. Information on these can be found at: <https://www.cbd.int/nbsap/related-info/sbsap/default.shtml>.

41. Six other NBSAPs⁴² contain elements or actions 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 territory plans/documents;

(b) The strategy of France will be incorporated as a priority into all public policy, at every territorial scale and frameworks must be put in place at every level of governance, from the global to the local and at all these levels;

(c) Malta intends to engage local councils in supporting the implementation of the NBSAP at the local/subnational level and will integrate biodiversity considerations into urban infrastructure investments;

³⁹ Afghanistan, Antigua and Barbuda, Belgium, Bhutan, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Congo, Equatorial Guinea, Georgia, Guyana, India, Italy, Mali, Namibia, Niger, Nigeria, Peru, Republic of Moldova, Sudan, Togo and Uganda.

⁴⁰ Austria, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Ireland, Japan, Nepal, Nigeria, Northern Ireland, Scotland and Republic of Korea.

⁴¹<https://www.cbd.int/nbsap/related-info/sbsap/default.shtml>

⁴² Australia, Belgium, France, Malta, Republic of Korea and United Kingdom.

(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 the Use of Biodiversity. The republic of Korea aims to have eight metropolitan or provincial strategies by 2018.

42. Five other Parties⁴³ have set national targets aiming at the development of subnational biodiversity plans:

(a) Australia – Target 9 – “By 2015, all jurisdictions will review relevant legislation, policies and programmes to maximize alignment with Australia’s Biodiversity Conservation Strategy”;

(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”.

6. Gender

43. A total of 23 Parties⁴⁴ make reference to gender issues and/or to the involvement of women in biodiversity conservation related actions. Among these:

(a) The NBSAPs of Burkina Faso, Georgia, Guyana, Cameroon, Nepal, Nigeria and Timor-Leste contain targets or actions on gender mainstreaming and/or the enhanced involvement of women; Several of these targets are national equivalents of Aichi Biodiversity Target 14 aiming to safeguard essential ecosystem services for women (among other vulnerable groups);

(b) In Uganda, provisions for Biodiversity Management have been mainstreamed into the National Gender Policy and the NBSAP contains an activity to promote accountability, transparency and gender mainstreaming in the implementation of biodiversity projects;

(c) Bhutan, Niger, Peru, the Dominican Republic, Guatemala and Myanmar include gender awareness, or equitable sharing of benefits among women and men, in the principles of their strategy;

(d) Tuvalu includes women as a Key Implementing Stakeholder (KIS) under their thematic area on sustainable use of natural resources.

⁴³ Australia, Cameroon, Burundi, India and Sudan.

⁴⁴ Bhutan, Burkina Faso, Cameroon, Dominican Republic, Equatorial Guinea, Eritrea, Georgia, Guatemala, Guyana, Japan, India, Mali, Mauritania, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Niger, Peru, Senegal, Timor-Leste, Togo, Tuvalu and Uganda.