## CBD National Reporting guidance 2022

### Summary of (CBD/SBI/3/11/Add.1/Amend.1)

We note that the proposed guidance will make the reporting process both simpler and more consistent between nations, and thus an opportunity to improve upon the “Aichi” reporting process. This approach will also make it easier to learn from other nations, sharing best practice, as envisaged in the Modus Operandi of the SBI, and working at a multinational scale.

The timelines for reporting will be tight, given the delays to CoP15, however, given the need for prompt transformative change, these short deadlines are inevitable. For example, the need for urgent action is recognised in Scottish Government policy and is part of NatureScot’s work planning.

The proposed template approach, the procedure manual (once available) and the instruction to integrate reporting with Nagoya (Access to Genetic Resources) and Cartagena Protocols (Biosafety), IPBES and Sustainable Development Goals reporting will ensure a more coordinated approach, reducing the risk of duplicating effort or of competing goals. They will also make it easier for signatories to focus on delivering tangible outcomes for biodiversity, rather than having to concentrate their efforts on the process itself. There are some minor points on word counts that could be clearer (i.e. in section IV are they for the whole section, per goal or per indicator), but this does not detract from the general usefulness of the document. Further, the alignment with the Sustainable Development Goals will help ensure that the delivery of biodiversity gains will be accompanied by improvements in the quality of life of all.

The proposal to include wider society, including local communities, business, NGOs and subnational governments, in the report production process is welcome and chimes with the Edinburgh Process. The option of peer review is also strongly welcomed. CBD reporting in Scotland was subject to independent scientific review and we found this approach to be helpful in ensuring scientific quality and transparency.

Overall, we welcome the text and find it helpful and pragmatic.

### Detailed points

The seventh national reports are due by 30 June 2025 (initial assessment of progress made towards the post-2020 global biodiversity framework) and the eighth national reports are due by June 30 2029 (a comprehensive review of progress in implementation). Both are to include financial information.

8th National report to include the most up-to-date data and information from as many sources as possible, including:

* the headline indicators
* component and complementary indicators and other national indicators, where relevant,
* the most recent reviews of national implementation and other national assessments, in particular the review of the implementation of national biodiversity strategies and action plans.

Reporting should be coordinated with Nagoya (Access to Genetic Resources) and Cartagena Protocol (Biosafety) reporting.

Parties are encouraged to involve relevant stakeholders in the preparation inc. industry, subnational governments, NGOs, local communities, academia and other citizen groups.

Will be a standardised format with a template. A manual with be provided. The draft template suggests quite a focussed document with suggested word counts.

Would be helpful if Section IV were clear on whether the word count is for the whole section, per goal or per indicator.

A

10c provision for voluntary peer review of reporting on national biodiversity strategies and

action plans (NBSAPs).

10f reporting will inform IPBES – makes reporting simpler and reduces duplication.

Will also integrate with Sustainable Development Goals.

Reporting can be via Data and Reporting Tool for Multilateral Environmental Agreements (DaRT) or by document upload for those operating with unstable Internet, and important consideration.