



Convention on Biological Diversity

Distr.
General

UNEP/CBD/WG-RI/4/INF/14
23 April 2012

ORIGINAL: ENGLISH

AD HOC OPEN-ENDED WORKING GROUP ON REVIEW OF IMPLEMENTATION OF THE CONVENTION

Fourth meeting
Montreal, 7 - 11 May 2012
Item 3 of the provisional agenda*

REPORT OF THE GLOBAL WORKSHOP ON NATIONAL EXPERIENCES IN IMPLEMENTING THE STRATEGIC PLAN FOR BIODIVERSITY 2011-2020

Information note by the Executive Secretary

I. INTRODUCTION

1. The Executive Secretary is pleased to circulate herewith, for the information of participants in the fourth meeting of the Ad Hoc Open-ended Working Group on Review of Implementation of the Convention, the report of the Global Workshop on National Experiences in implementing the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020, held in Brasilia, from 12 to 14 March 2012. Further details are available on the Convention's website at: <http://www.cbd.int/sp/global-workshop/>

* UNEP/CBD/WG-RI/4/1.

**Report of the Global Workshop on National Experiences in implementing the
Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020
(Brasilia, 12-14 March 2012)**

Hosted by

- UK Department for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs (Defra)
- Ministry of the Environment, Brazil

In collaboration with

- Secretariat of the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD)

Co-chaired by

- Mr. Robin Mortimer (Director, Wildlife, Landscape and Rural Affairs, Department of Environment, Food and Rural Affairs, United Kingdom)
- Dr. Roberto Cavalcanti (Secretary of Biodiversity and Forests, Ministry of the Environment, Brazil)

INTRODUCTION

The Workshop was an informal expert consultation, co-hosted by the Governments of Brazil and the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, and organized in cooperation with the Secretariat of the Convention on Biological Diversity (SCBD). The workshop was professionally facilitated and took place from 12 to 14 March 2012 in Brasilia, Brazil. This is the full report of the meeting.

The regionally balanced workshop brought together Government nominated experts from 54 countries and the European Union.

The Workshop also included representatives of a number of international, inter-governmental, and non-governmental organizations.

A list of participants is provided at Annex 1.

Aims and objectives

At the tenth meeting of the Conference of the Parties to the CBD in Nagoya, Japan, in October 2010, Parties adopted the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020, including 20 ambitious “Aichi Biodiversity Targets” to be achieved by 2020 or earlier.

The purpose of the Workshop was to provide an informal setting where countries could share examples and experiences in their efforts to meet the challenges associated with updating their National Biodiversity Strategies and Action Plans (NBSAPs), in line with the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020, and with setting national targets, as a contribution towards the global Aichi Biodiversity Targets. The Workshop was also intended to assist Parties prepare for the discussion of these issues at the fourth meeting of the Working Group on Review of Implementation of the Convention (WGRI-4) in May 2012, and to add further momentum to the process in the lead-up to COP-11 in October 2012.

The Workshop was structured around national progress made in regard to the following four aspects of implementation of the Strategic Plan: 1) progress and challenges with revision of NBSAPs; 2) target-setting; 3) mainstreaming biodiversity into landscapes and economic sectors; 4) resources and partnerships for implementation. It was conducted in a very participatory, problem-solving style, with only short presentations for “scene-setting” and with expert facilitation of breakout groups.

Workshop programme

The meeting followed the Workshop programme and the Supplementary Note to the Workshop programme, set out in UNEP/CBD/WSSPNE/1/1 and UNEP/CBD/WSSPNE/1/1/Add.1, respectively. These documents are provided in Annex 2.

I. OUTCOMES OF THE WORKSHOP

Views indicated in this summary from the Workshop are not necessarily representative of, or agreed by, all participants.

A: General messages from the Workshop:

- **NBSAPs are a key part of delivering the 2020 global goal.** Most action on biodiversity takes place at the national and sub-national levels and NBSAPs provide a focal point for leadership, engagement and resource mobilization to deliver national goals and targets.
- **Sharing experiences** between countries and regions on revising NBSAPs, setting national targets, developing tools for successful implementation and mobilizing resources will be critical if we are to meet the Aichi Biodiversity Targets.
- **Raising awareness** of the importance and value of biodiversity across all sectors, and at the highest political level, is necessary, and will continue to be necessary, if we are to meet the Aichi Biodiversity Targets.
- **Building the knowledge base** on biodiversity and **closing the science-policy gap** will be critical if we are to meet the Aichi Biodiversity Targets.
- **Every country will need to play their part** if we are to meet the Aichi Biodiversity Targets.

B: Specific points that emerged from the discussion on the process of revising NBSAPs

- Revising NBSAPs to fully incorporate the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020 takes **time, expertise, money** and **resources**.
- **NBSAPs need to be adopted as a policy tool** and **political will** is critical for successfully revising, adopting and implementing a revised NBSAP. **Political buy-in is needed across all political parties**, at the highest level and across all Government Departments, if successful implementation of NBSAPs is to be achieved.
- **Engaging all relevant stakeholders at an early stage** in the revision of the NBSAP process, in particular in the development and implementation of targets, can help raise awareness and secure buy-in to the process.
- **Mainstreaming of biodiversity strategies and action plans will only be effective when the activities of other sectors fully reflect the needs for biodiversity conservation and sustainable use.** Consideration of biodiversity needs to be embedded into all relevant sectors (including the private sector) and recognized as being important and necessary by those sectors. Mainstreaming is often best achieved through building on “win-win” opportunities that can be identified by regular exchange of information through formal or informal exchanges of information .
- **Building in regular monitoring of progress** towards implementation of NBSAPs will be necessary if the global 2020 Aichi Biodiversity Targets are to be met. Using tools such as indicators is a helpful way of doing this.

C: Specific points that emerged from the discussion on target setting

- We need **‘SMART’** outputs, targets and/or indicators to be able to assess progress in a semi-quantitative manner.
- In particular, targets need to be **MEASURABLE**. This can be achieved either by including a quantitative element within the target itself or by supplementing a broad target with a suite of more specific ‘measurable’ sub-targets or indicators. **Baseline information** for these will be important.
- There is a **quality-versus-quantity** issue when setting certain targets. In some instances setting targets that are quantifiable may not necessarily lead to the broader outcomes that

are required. In such instances, qualitative targets may be more appropriate. For example, the quality of habitat management may be just as important as the number of hectares under sustainable management.

- When setting targets, it is **important to build on what has already been achieved, including in the context of other relevant national, regional and international frameworks.**
- Achieving national targets will require that the **resources required to successfully implement the target are considered in parallel** to setting the target to ensure that it is both realistic and deliverable within the specified timeframe.
- In some instances, setting **process-oriented targets/goals can be useful** e.g. on signing/ratifying the Nagoya Protocol.
- There is real **value in embedding a multidisciplinary and multi-stakeholder review process** when setting targets to ensure that they are SMART, relevant to the national context and implementable on the ground.

D: Specific points that emerged from the discussion on mainstreaming

Implementation of the Strategic Plan will require thinking well beyond traditional biodiversity conservation measures. This will mean **engaging with processes beyond the CBD, as demonstrated by the endorsement of the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020 by the [65th Meeting of the United Nations General Assembly \(UNGA\)](#)**. Some of the main barriers towards implementation are **lack of societal buy-in** and a **lack of knowledge** on how and **why biodiversity is important to other sectors**. A number of different strategies could be useful in helping countries to successfully mainstream biodiversity:

- **Political strategies** – influencing up e.g. getting to politicians' manifestos, using high-status government documents/processes to influence
- **Engagement strategies** – e.g. using cross sector approaches, bringing in indigenous groups into political processes, using concepts and language which make sense to other sectors (ecosystem approach, valuation etc.) and dealing with conflicts that arise and being clear on how biodiversity can bring benefits; being honest about both trade-offs and win-win opportunities.
- **Institutional strategies** – such as the [UK Natural Capital Committee](#) (reporting to the finance Ministry)
- **Evidence strategies** – having compelling evidence to make the case e.g. being able to explain the societal and economic benefits of biodiversity on different sectors

E: Specific points that emerged from the discussion on resource mobilization

- Clear mechanisms are needed, which **recognize the complexity of various funding sources for a range of purposes**, recognizing differing needs, to **assess resource requirements** both at the national level and overall. This will ensure a credible framework for resource mobilization
- **Access to the necessary finances** at both the national and international levels is one of the key barriers, and opportunities, towards successful revision of NBSAPs.
- There is a **lack of resources** more generally for biodiversity conservation. **New and innovative resource mobilization strategies are therefore needed** if countries are to successfully implement their NBSAPs.
- There is a **lack of capacity in expertise for accessing new and innovative finances at national level**. There is a need for sustained, specific training and personnel for tools for accessing resources.

- **Translation of the concept of valuation of biodiversity and ecosystem services into practical tools** that countries can use at the national level is needed to raise awareness of the importance of biodiversity in order to mobilize new and innovative sources of funding.
- There is a need **to simplify language about resource mobilization and finance so that it is comprehensible to all stakeholders.**
- There is also a need for **transparency and accountability** when accessing funding sources.
- The discussions which will be held under **Rio +20** may help contribute towards the resource mobilization discussions under the CBD.

F: Specific points that emerged from the discussion on aggregation

- It will be important for countries to attempt to **map their 'national targets' to the Aichi Biodiversity Targets** in order that global progress can be monitored.
- **Support from the Secretariat** to help implement the Aichi Biodiversity Targets at the national level may be helpful in some cases. The Secretariat could also usefully provide a review function to countries on whether national targets are too ambitious or not ambitious enough.
- **Regular monitoring of progress against the targets** at both the national, regional and global levels is needed, to ensure we are on track to meeting the Aichi Biodiversity Targets.
- **The COP has a responsibility to keep the implementation of the Convention under review** and there are relevant CBD COP10 decisions which Parties will need to report against to ensure that they are on track in meeting the Aichi Biodiversity Targets.

II. REPORT OF THE WORKING SESSIONS

Opening of the Workshop

Opening statements were delivered by the Workshop Co-Chairs, Mr. Robin Mortimer and Mr. Roberto Cavalcanti. A written statement by Izabella Teixeira, Minister of Environment for Brazil was delivered, and a video message by Mr. Richard Benyon, Minister of Environment, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland was shown.

Mr. Jongsoo Yoon, Vice Minister of Environment of the Republic of Korea and Mr. Alan Charlton, UK Ambassador to Brazil also delivered opening statements.

Note: The full version of the presentations summarized below can be downloaded on the CBD website.

Item 1 - Revision of National Biodiversity Strategies and Action Plans (NBSAPs) – or their equivalent – to contribute adequately to the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020

Presenters:

Mr. David Duthie (CBD Secretariat) - A review of the global status of early implementation of the Strategic Plan and NBSAP revision

The CBD Secretariat provided an overview of the Strategic Plan for biodiversity and its associated Aichi Biodiversity Targets, plus the timelines CBD Parties have adopted to put in place revised NBSAPs (2014 at latest) with national targets (by CoP-11 in October 2012). The status of GEF support to the NBSAP revision process was also summarized, as was the capacity building support being provided to developing countries for NBSAP revision and implementation of the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020 through the Japan Biodiversity Fund.

Ms. Noriko Moriwake (Japan) – Japan's experience in revising its NBSAP and recent developments

Ms. Moriwake highlighted the importance of the Basic Act on Biodiversity (2008) in providing a strong mandate for the national biodiversity planning process in Japan. Japan is currently preparing the 5th edition of its National Biodiversity Strategy, including review of the implementation success and gap analysis of the 4th NBS and further development of a suite of indicators to reflect the global Aichi Biodiversity Targets. Ms. Moriwake also described the progress that Japan is making with devolution of the NBS to sub-national (Prefecture) level and with the integration of Satoyama Initiative principles and post-tsunami recovery plans into national biodiversity planning.

Mr. Duncan Williams (United Kingdom) – Lessons learned from the UK NBSAP revision process

Mr. Williams described how the new national biodiversity strategy for England built on the UK National Ecosystem Assessment and other scientific assessment and policy renewal processes to formulate a nationally-appropriate strategy consistent with the goals and targets of the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020. A key feature of the process was iterative consultation with stakeholders at a range of levels to maximize ownership and engagement in implementation.

Ms. Diana Ramirez (Guatemala) – Guatemala’s revision of the NBSAP process

Ms. Ramirez’s presentation again highlighted the importance of high-level endorsement of the biodiversity strategy, in this case in the form of a national Biodiversity Policy adopted by Government. She highlighted the importance of a clear demonstration of the value of biodiversity to the national biodiversity planning process, especially in regard to consultations with local communities.

Mr. Thomas Koetz (European Union) – The European Union’s Biodiversity Strategy to 2020: Our life insurance – Our natural capital

Mr. Koetz outlined the EU’s recently adopted Biodiversity Strategy, which was developed to be in line with the global Aichi Biodiversity Targets. The Strategy contains 6 “targets” linked to a series of Actions. These major Targets contain separate SMART targets to map fairly easily to the global Aichi Biodiversity Targets. The presentation also included a consideration of the implementation timelines required to meet the overall objectives of the Strategic Plan.

In a group exercise, participants were requested to assess the contribution that their CURRENT NBSAP was making towards implementation of the Strategic Plan, and to assess how effective ongoing implementation of the current plan had been. In addition, participants summarized some of the major achievements of the current NBSAP and some of the challenges faced in the NBSAP implementation – the outputs of this exercise can be seen at Annex 3.

Item 2 - National target-setting to contribute to the global Aichi Biodiversity Targets

Presenters:

Dr. Roberto Cavalcanti – Transforming pre-2010 targets into 2020 targets

Dr. Cavalcanti spoke about the need for conservation values to be more broadly appreciated by all levels of society, and also highlighted the growing conservation challenges facing developing countries. He briefly touched upon the efforts that Brazil has been making in terms of integrating biodiversity targets into national policy-making.

Mr. Paul Rose (United Kingdom) – UK experience with national target-setting to contribute to the Aichi Biodiversity Targets

Mr. Rose provided an overview of how the national biodiversity strategy for England has addressed the need to introduce quantification of objectives into national biodiversity planning through the adoption of SMART outputs, targets or indicators. In the UK case, this has been achieved mostly by the use of a broad range of indicators, linked to existing data sets with extensive baselines that allow assessment of trends. The presentation provided a useful example of how a comprehensive set of quantitative national indicators may be mapped against the global Aichi Biodiversity Targets.

In the break-out group exercises during this part of the workshop, participants focused on the Aichi Biodiversity Targets associated with each of the Strategic Plan Goals and attempted to develop SMART targets appropriate for one country in the group. The exercise included a review process where a second group was asked to assess the “SMART-ness” of the proposed national target. A list of the Targets proposed by the groups is included at Annex 4.

Item 3 - Mainstreaming NBSAPs into landscapes, sectors and development policy (national experience)

Presenters:

Ms. Malta Qwathekana (South Africa) – South Africa’s experience with mainstreaming biodiversity beyond protected areas into community and private sector landscapes

Ms. Qwathekana provided an overview of the way that South Africa has been integrating biodiversity conservation and sustainable use into landscapes, especially as a result of the use of geo-referenced biodiversity inventory and planning information to explore innovative options for biodiversity-friendly land use options. The presentation also highlighted how biodiversity has been integrated into different economic sectors through the use of novel mechanisms, such as “Working for Water” which combines reduction of threat from Invasive Alien Species (IAS) with poverty alleviation and increased water provisioning services.

Ms. Andrea Cruz Angon (Mexico) – Mexico’s experience with mainstreaming biodiversity

Ms. Agnon provided a concise summary of the work that the Mexican Biodiversity Institute, CONABIO, has been doing to provide geo-referenced biodiversity information in a policy-neutral manner to a wide range of government institutions to promote biodiversity-friendly cross-sectoral policy-making.

In a group exercise, participants explored the barriers and opportunities for mainstreaming through an “open shop” discussion with a panel of countries that volunteered to share their experience (South Africa, Mexico, UK, Brazil, Venezuela, Colombia, Norway, Guatemala, Japan, and Ghana). Summary points from these discussions are at Annex 5.

Item 4 - The resource challenge – finance, participation and partnerships (selected success stories for NBSAP planning AND implementation)

Participants were provided with an update of the outcomes of the CBD “[Dialogue seminar on scaling up finance for biodiversity](#)” held in Quito, Ecuador from 6-9 March 2010². Breakout groups discussed the opportunities and challenges to applying different financing options at national level (see table at Annex 6).

Item 5 - Aggregation – how do we track and scale-up reporting on national progress towards the global Aichi Biodiversity Targets?

A final brief session addressed the issue of how to ensure that national targets contribute to the global Aichi Biodiversity Targets and how national targets can be quantified and aggregated up to assess progress towards the global Aichi Biodiversity Targets. A summary of the main points arising from the discussion is at page 6. This issue will need further consideration at the forthcoming 4th meeting of the **Ad Hoc Open-ended Working Group on Review of Implementation of the Convention** (WGRI) to be held Montreal from 7-11 May 2102.

Annex 1

List of Participants

(available in PDF version of report at <http://www.cbd.int/sp/global-workshop/>)

Annex 2

Workshop Documents

UNEP/CBD/WSSPNE/1/1
29 February 2012

Workshop Programme

Note: Working hours are 0900-1800 daily, with tea/coffee breaks in the morning (1100-1130) and afternoon (1530-1600) and 1 hour for lunch (1300-1400). Sessions will be a mix of national presentations and facilitated smaller working groups.

Monday, 12 March

- | | |
|-----------|---|
| 0900-0930 | Opening of the workshop – Statements from UK and Brazil workshop co-hosts and from CBD Executive Secretary, plus video messages from Ms. Izabella Teixeira (Ministra do Meio Ambiente do Brasil) and Ms. Caroline Spelman (Secretary of State for the UK Department of Environment, Food and Rural Affairs) |
| 0930-1030 | Aims and objectives of the workshop; Self-introductions |
| 1030-1800 | Item 1: Revision of National Biodiversity Strategies and Action Plans (NBSAPs) – or their equivalent – to contribute adequately to the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020 |

Tuesday, 13 March

- | | |
|-----------|--|
| 0900-1300 | Item 2: National target-setting to contribute to the global Aichi Biodiversity Targets |
| 1400-1800 | Item 3: Mainstreaming NBSAPs into landscapes, sectors and development policy (national experience) |

Wednesday, 14 March

- | | |
|-----------|---|
| 0900-1300 | Item 4: The resource challenge – finance, participation and partnerships (selected success stories for NBSAP planning AND implementation) |
| 1400-1530 | Item 5: Aggregation – how do we track and scale-up reporting on national progress towards the global Aichi Biodiversity Targets? |
| 1600-1800 | Item 6: Final discussion and conclusions |

Supplementary Note to the Workshop Programme

Background

The Conference of the Parties, at its tenth meeting in 2010 in Aichi-Nagoya, Japan, adopted the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020, including the Aichi Biodiversity Targets ([decision X/2](#)). By this decision, countries are urged to update their National Biodiversity Strategies and Action Plans (NBSAPs) in line with the new Strategic Plan, to set national targets in line with the Aichi Biodiversity Targets, and to report to COP-11 in Hyderabad, India, in October 2012, on progress achieved.

The overall aim of this workshop is to share examples and the experience of countries on their progress towards addressing and meeting challenges, and thereby help Parties prepare for the discussion of this issue at the fourth meeting of the Working Group on Review of Implementation of the Convention (WGRI-4) in Montreal, Canada, in May 2012.

The workshop will also provide an opportunity to identify and explore ways to overcome obstacles to progress, and identify examples of how these can be overcome through capacity-building, technical and scientific cooperation and resource mobilization.

This workshop will build upon the experience shared in the joint UK/Brazil “Informal Expert Workshop on the updating of the Strategic Plan of the Convention for the post-2010 period” held in London in January 2010 (see: <http://www.cbd.int/doc/?meeting=EM-StratPlan-01>).

The workshop will also draw upon and complement the series of regional and sub-regional capacity-building workshops on updating NBSAPs being convened by the CBD Secretariat with the support of Japan and other donors (see: <http://www.cbd.int/nbsap/workshops2.shtml>).

Workshop Objective

To review early progress and preparations towards the full and effective implementation of the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020 and its associated Aichi Biodiversity Targets, and to identify challenges to, and opportunities for, improved implementation so that these issues can be further considered by WGRI-4 and COP-11.

Workshop *modus operandi*

The workshop will be conducted in a fully participatory manner, with professional facilitation to assist all participants to share their experience with:

- (i) revision of NBSAPs;
- (ii) setting of national targets and assessing progress towards global targets;
- (iii) effective integration (mainstreaming) of biodiversity into landscapes and sectors; and
- (iv) identification of resource and partnership opportunities for effective implementation of the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020.

The workshop will be conducted over 3 days, and comprise a mixture of presentations, plenary discussions, parallel working groups and reporting back. A final synthesis session will generate conclusions to be carried forward to WGRI-4 and COP-11.

The workshop will consider five main topics:

1. Revision of National Biodiversity Strategies and Action Plans (NBSAPs) – or their equivalent - to contribute adequately to the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020;
2. National target-setting to contribute to the global Aichi Biodiversity Targets;
3. Mainstreaming NBSAPs into landscapes, sectors and development policy (national experience);
4. The resource challenge – finance, participation and partnerships (selected success stories for NBSAP planning AND implementation); and
5. Assessing progress from a global perspective – how do we track and scale-up reporting on national progress towards the global Aichi Biodiversity Targets?

Details of each session and further information on how participants can prepare to contribute to the workshop are provided below.

1. *Revision of National Biodiversity Strategy and Action Plans (NBSAPs)*

The goals for this session are to:

- (i) assess global progress in regard to the revision of NBSAPs;
- (ii) identify critical success factors that are allowing some countries to make rapid progress;
- (iii) assess whether ongoing revisions will have sufficient scope to allow successful national implementation of the Strategic Plan; and
- (iv) identify major barriers to progress.

The CBD Secretariat will provide information of the status of NBSAP revisions at the global level since COP-10 in Nagoya, including an update of the status of GEF support to the NBSAP revision process. Some Parties will present short case studies of their national NBSAP revision processes.

Participants will have the opportunity to provide brief verbal reports on their national NBSAP revision process. Participants will work in small groups to assess the scope of their existing NBSAP, and the status of its implementation, against the 5 Goals of the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020. Based on this assessment, participants will identify the major opportunities and/or barriers to revising NBSAPs to incorporate the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity in a nationally-appropriate manner.

The workshop facilitator will assist the participants to synthesize the work of the small groups into general conclusions to be carried forward to WGRI-4 and COP-11.

In preparation for this session, please ensure that you have the latest information on your current NBSAP but, more importantly, also on the status of your NBSAP revision process, with an estimate of the date of completion, and the level of adoption that is likely to be achieved (e.g. Ministerial Decree, Act of Parliament, etc.).

Working with your national colleagues, attempt to assess the scope of your current NBSAP against each of the 5 Goals of the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020, on a scale of 1 to 5, in order to better identify the “gaps” in the NBSAP that need to be addressed in the revision process. These gaps can be assessed at the level of the scope of the current NBSAP, but also in terms of the *implementation* of the current NBSAP.

2. *National target-setting to contribute to the global Aichi Biodiversity Targets*

Some Parties adopted quantitative national targets as a part of their efforts to meet the global 2010 Biodiversity Target to “significantly reduce the rate of loss of biodiversity” (see <http://www.cbd.int/nbsap/about/targets/> for examples). However, the global 2010 Biodiversity Target was not met, and the overwhelming majority of countries stated, in their fourth national reports, that the 2010 Biodiversity Target had not been met at the national level either, even though some significant improvements at the sub-national level were reported.

Now, eighteen months after COP-10 and with just over 6 months before COP-11, very few Parties have established comprehensive sets of national targets that document their contribution to the global Aichi Biodiversity Targets.

Day 2 of the workshop will focus on the experience of some “pioneer” countries, whilst also allowing other Parties to provide updates on their experience to date with target-setting. Participants will also complete exercises to become more familiar with the characteristics of SMART targets. If any quantitative targets have been discussed or adopted as a part of your NBSAP revision process, please be prepared to provide details as part of the working group discussions.

In a later session of the workshop, participants will have an opportunity to assess how national targets can be used to assess progress towards the global Aichi Biodiversity Targets. The fifth and sixth national reports will be the main instruments for monitoring progress towards the 2020 targets, but this will be difficult if countries have not established SMART targets and put in place adequate sets of indicators to monitor progress.

3. *Mainstreaming NBSAPs into landscapes, sectors and development policy (national experience)*

The history of human economic development, over the past 200 years, has been one of accelerating conversion of natural ecosystems to landscapes and seascapes increasingly influenced by human activities.

As this transition occurs, there is an ever-increasing need for landscape management to minimize continued loss through land use change, overexploitation, pollution, invasive species and, increasingly, through climate change. There is also a need to address the underlying social and economic drivers of biodiversity loss.

Mainstreaming biodiversity (CBD Article 6(b)) still constitutes a major challenge to the successful implementation of the Convention at the national level. Successful mainstreaming requires the full integration of “biodiversity thinking” and decision-making from the environment sector in all of the land use and economic sectors that generate the direct and indirect drivers of biodiversity loss.

The Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020 is a response to the message from GBO-3 that greater emphasis needs to be given to reducing the impact of the underlying indirect drivers of biodiversity decline and, also, to generating greater flows of benefits from land use that is compatible with sustaining biodiversity.

In the afternoon of Day 2, participants will discuss examples of successful mainstreaming at both the landscape level and in economic sectors (agriculture, forestry, energy, mining) and work in small groups to identify opportunities and challenges to applying the same techniques in different countries over the next 10 years.

4. *The resource challenge – finance, participation and partnerships*

The Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020 is “ambitious, but achievable”, and achieving the overall objective of the Plan will be essential to determining the long-term future of biodiversity over the next millennium. It is clear that, to achieve the overall goal of the Strategic Plan, a significant increase in resources, participation and partnerships will be required.

Earlier estimates of global conservation needs range up to many tens of billions USD per year. The Conference of the Parties has requested the CBD Secretariat to complete two new global resource needs assessment and to report to the Fourth Meeting of the Working Group on Review of Implementation in May 2102.

Financing for biodiversity will need to come from all sources: public and private; domestic and international. To date the main source of finance has been domestic budget- at the national and sub-

national levels, supplemented by development cooperation. At the international level, the Global Environment Facility, the Financial Mechanism for the Convention, has been the primary source of funding for biodiversity planning, through the Biodiversity Focal Area Enabling Activities which have supported preparation of National Biodiversity Strategies and Action Plans (NBSAPs), CHM activities and National Reports. The GEF also provides incremental cost support for implementation of priority actions that focus on globally-significant biodiversity.

Participants will receive a briefing on the outcome of the “Dialogue seminar on scaling up finance for biodiversity” to be held from 6 to 9 March 2012 in Quito, Ecuador, and will have the opportunity to discuss the opportunities and constraints to the use of different finance/funding mechanisms at the national level.

In addition, participants will have the opportunity to identify additional technical support needs, beyond financial resources, including scientific and technical support through South-South and North-South-South cooperation, IPBES, etc.

5. *Assessing progress from a Global Perspective – how do we track and scale-up reporting on national progress towards the global Aichi Biodiversity Targets?*

In this session of the workshop, participants will have an opportunity to assess how national targets “add up” at a global level in terms of progress towards the global Aichi Biodiversity Targets. The fifth and sixth national reports will be the main instruments for monitoring progress towards the 2020 targets, but this will be difficult if countries have not established SMART targets and put in place adequate sets of indicators to monitor progress. Participants will be asked to test, in small working groups, how to “scale-up” national targets to generate aggregate statistics that can be used to monitor implementation of the Strategic Plan on a global scale, and to identify the barriers to successful aggregation for selected Aichi Biodiversity Targets.

6. *Conclusions*

A final session of the workshop will allow the Co-Chairs of the meeting, Brazil and the UK, to draw conclusions from the four main themes of the workshop, and to discuss with participants how best to carry these forward from the workshop into the fourth meeting of the Working Group on Review of Implementation (WGRI) and the eleventh meeting of the Conference of the Parties, to be held in May 2012 and October 2012, respectively.

Annex 3

Summary of some of the major achievements of the current NBSAP and some of the challenges faced in the NBSAP implementation

What I'm most proud of	What most concerns me
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Started review process in line with Aichi Targets - Cross-sectoral consultations - Established Biodiversity Committee - Mainstreaming biodiversity issues into national population strategies (and Poverty Reduction Strategies) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Weak cooperation/political support from other sectors - Implementation (human capacity, financial resources, inadequate coordination) - NAP not in line with Aichi Targets - Time - Monitoring and evaluation in short term
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Inter-ministerial consultations - revised regularly - annual progress check - decided by the whole government (Cabinet) - NBSAP well represented /designed 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Implementation including means (resources) and monitoring - Awareness about biodiversity - Lack of stakeholders' engagement/engagement at all levels (better understanding required)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Leadership collaboration - Ministry focus on environmental issues (including biodiversity) - Stakeholder interest and input/involvement - Legislation development/enactment - Established processes to reach national goals - Taking more advantage of all available international funding - Improved technical will and capacity for environment agencies 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Financial resources - Timelines (accessibility, report completion) - Human resources (capacity) and numbers - Political will (lack of) - Enforcement (lack of) - Sustainability of the process (succession planning) - Lack of biodiversity mainstreaming
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Completing GEF application procedure - NBSAP Steering/Working Committee established - New NBSAP done! - Identifying stakeholders - Civil society attention - Already have NBSAP, and in the process of revising it - COP Guidelines - Convention itself - Private sector 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Limited time - Mobilization of funding - No political support - Evidence base - How to make the NBSAP work at the ground level - Stakeholder participation, cooperation, communication (government and academia) - Continuity of political will - Agricultural modernization without consideration of biodiversity - Mainstreaming across sectors and regions - Private sector - Incentives for all people
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - NGO sector and biodiversity protection service of MOE are cooperating tightly in the process (that was missed earlier) - Identifying stakeholders - Strengthening national coordination - Mainstreaming biodiversity in some sectors of economic and development activities - Updated! - Already have NBSAP and in process of updating and revising it 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Identification of national targets according to the Aichi Targets - Building capacity - Development projects are running very actively in the country and there might be barriers in the process of mainstreaming biodiversity - Implementation - CHM - Funding

What I'm most proud of	What most concerns me
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Guiding framework to link national to local processes - Updating ABS Bill to reflect Aichi Targets; signing and ratifying - Interest of private sector to contribute - Integration of other sectors at strategic levels - Continued and increased commitment re protected areas network (e.g. SPERRGEBIET / Namib Escarpment / Coral Triangle / Micronesia Challenge / LMMA) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Direct access of GEF-5 Enabling Act Fund - Lack of capacity - Scattered information/data - Political priority in economic crisis - Turning commitments into practical actions - Donor dependency - Local communities' priorities - Lack of coordination
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Achieving Agreement of National Policy , Political Buy-In - Developing NBSAP in line with Strategic Plan for Biodiversity - Developed planning process for NBSAP - Developing integrated action plan for protected areas - Sharing experiences with other countries at the workshop - Mainstreaming into development agenda 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Lots of evidence of problems but need agreement on solutions - Reliance on GEF to start NBSAP review process - Integration of biodiversity into other sectors - Insufficient resources - Environment given lower priority than other sectors - Government really putting strategy into practice - Accessing resources (too many barriers)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Focus on biodiversity outcomes - 2002 (early) Strategy and revised Strategy - Biodiversity is of national importance (governments and stakeholders) - Partnerships - Strategies and Actions Plans and Priorities - Cooperation (inter-governmental) - Political will - Translating NBSAPs into policy – implementation 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Mainstreaming (only ideas) - Mainstreaming (monitoring) - Practical tools for valuation - Baseline information - Capacity (financial and technical) - Political will (communication) - Integrating poverty and biodiversity - Access to financial resources - Collating and using available information
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - All sectors reporting what the main interests are - Consultation with many sectors - Good technology for information on biodiversity management - Articulation mechanism with governmental actors, provinces and civil society is established and strong - Clear conceptual framework of the necessity of an integrated policy 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Monitoring large territory and multiple governments/states - Monitoring - Collaborative working between different governmental bodies - Monitoring the process of construction of the Strategy - Ensure effective participation of all the stakeholders as a continuous process - Monitoring the effects of policy/activities

Annex 4

“SMART” national targets proposed by groups

STRATEGIC GOAL	PROBLEM IDENTIFICATION	PROPOSED TARGET
B: Reduce the direct pressures on biodiversity and promote sustainable use	<p>Agriculture sector (esp. cocoa plantation)</p> <p>Mining, both by larger mining companies and local populations</p> <p>Timber logging, both by larger companies and local people</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) By 2020, at the latest, biodiversity values are incorporated into the medium-term development plan for the agricultural sector to increase the proportion of certified cocoa plantations by 50%. (Same for forestry sector) 2) By 2020, sector-based guidelines have been developed, biodiversity mainstreaming is adopted and effectively used in the national planning commission; 10% of key biodiversity areas is conserved. 3) By 2020, 10% of the areas delivering multiple ecosystem services to the poor are placed under protection as part of the revised National Development Plan.
B: Reduce the direct pressures on biodiversity and promote sustainable use	Target 9 (Invasives)	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) By 2014, pathways are known and priorities identified. 2) By 2014, prioritize species for eradication and continue to eradicate them. 3) By 2015, measures are in place to manage pathways... 4) By 2020, measures to manage pathways have been implemented.
B: Reduce the direct pressures on biodiversity and promote sustainable use	<p>Targets 5, 7, 8, 9 (partially 6, 10)</p> <p>Problem being considered:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Land use change - Lack of territorial planning instruments 	By 2015, all 24 provinces in Country X have land use plans based on biodiversity and sustainable use, including management instruments.
C: Improve the status of biodiversity by safeguarding ecosystems, species and genetic diversity	<p>Target 11</p> <p>Problem: Wish to increase Protected Areas</p>	<p>To conserve at least 30% of the near shore marine resources and 20% of terrestrial across Country X by 2020.</p> <p>To create (extend) protected areas by an additional 5% by the creation of a new national park by 2015, and to create a national ecological network adding a further 8% by 2020.</p>
C: Improve the status of biodiversity by safeguarding ecosystems, species and genetic diversity	<p>Target 11</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Protected area not inventorised - Encroachment (Population Pressure) 	<p>By 2020, integrated plans have been developed for all protected areas <u>with community involvement</u> including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - management plan, administration

STRATEGIC GOAL	PROBLEM IDENTIFICATION	PROPOSED TARGET
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Fragmentation of ecological networks <p>Target 12</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Lack of information on status of flora (endangered, endemic species) - Forest trees, food crops and medicinal plants threatened 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - business plan - site management plan – ecological integrity <p>with an overall protected areas <u>strategy</u> in place at the national level, including a communication strategy, monitoring and assessment mechanisms.</p>
C: Improve the status of biodiversity by safeguarding ecosystems, species and genetic diversity		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - By 2020, our country would have 20% protected areas, comprising inland and wetland areas, which will be inventorised, where encroachment is prevented/controlled, ecological corridors established. - By 2020, biodiversity resources are inventorised, gene bank established in communities, depleted areas rehabilitated and extinction prevented.
D: Enhance the benefits to all from biodiversity and ecosystem services	<p>Problems identified re marine ecosystems:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Human activities: exploitation, pollution, petroleum extraction - Transboundary pollution - Climate change - IAS 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) To maintain or restore the structure, productivity, biodiversity of the marine ecosystems and to ensure the creation of values through the sustainable use of ecosystem services. 2) The extinction of threatened marine species shall be halted or the status for species in decline should be improved by 2020.
D: Enhance the benefits to all from biodiversity and ecosystem services	<p>Problem:</p> <p>The development of national legislation and the implementation of all activities that would be necessary to comply with the Nagoya Protocol on ABS.</p>	<p>Country X has national legislation that addresses ABS by 2014, and the operational mechanism to enforce the law by 2018.</p>
E: Enhance implementation through participatory planning, knowledge management and capacity building		<p>By December 2014, Country X will have reviewed and updated its NBSAP through a broad based participatory approach and adopted it as a policy instrument for biodiversity conservation, and at least 80% of the NBSAP actions will have been implemented by 2020.</p>

Annex 5

Barriers and opportunities for mainstreaming biodiversity

Barriers	Success Factors
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Accessing (GEF) funding (also time it takes) - Political will (Priority) - Capacity (human, other) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Consensus (total engagement) - Total awareness - Networking
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - More focus on economic development - Lack of knowledge/awareness on biodiversity of decision-makers - Bureaucracy (rapid changes in government) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Political will - Stakeholders' involvement - Incentives
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Access to GEF funds too slow (solutions use external expertise instead of building local capacity) - Biodiversity not a priority in others sectors despite mainstreaming - Lack of information - Lack of translating national strategies into local plans 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Mainstreaming effectively - Effective stakeholder engagement
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Finance - Time – not sure what implementation works yet - Valuation tools - Land ownership issues 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Legislation - Partnerships - Solid science
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Lack of valuation mechanisms that are implemented/established at a national level - Strong economic drivers that are unsustainable - Lack of clear mechanisms to guarantee benefit-sharing from biodiversity and ecosystem services 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Building awareness and perception of the importance of biodiversity - National political frameworks and planning processes established - Awareness of the link between science/knowledge and policy
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Government "buy-in" (*stated by most respondents) - Political commitment (need for engagement) - Lack of knowledge about sending biodiversity "message" to overcome fear of change in sectors - Lack of "buy-in" from other sectors - No clear and precise indicators - Difficulty to integrate into development; Convincing other sectors that biodiversity loss is a responsibility of all sectors and will have negative impacts on sectors - Conflicting priorities of sectors 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Use personal contacts and networks of contacts as entry points to other sectors - Stakeholder engagement and involvement, including ILCs - NBSAP priorities are mainstreamed into the national development policy - Develop agreed inter-ministrial agendas for mainstreaming - Joint workshops to develop common agendas and ownership - Rapid revision allows "evolution" of NBSAP - Cabinet-level decision supported by Act - Regular monitoring of implementation - Jointly-implemented projects – especially for restoration - Use high-profile media events to stimulate private sector interest and stimulate business engagement (e.g. hosting a CoP for Japan) - Recognise the mandates of other sectors and work together to find mutual solutions (e.g. Working for Water) - Use spatial planning as a communication and planning tool - Use ex-situ conservation as a "back-up" strategy

Annex 6

Results of the table discussions on mobilizing resources

Problems in mobilizing resources	Causes	Solutions
Internal		
Low priority in the Government		
Government priority at cabinet level is low for environment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lack of awareness at cabinet level on the importance of biodiversity and its economic value • Priority for economic development • Don't understand the ability of biodiversity to empower the people by making them economically independent (those who depend on biodiversity to survive) • Dependency on donor funds rather than self • Concerned only with the activities of their political term, not the future or sustainability 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sustained awareness campaigns for policy makers • Promote economic valuation of biodiversity (i.e. TEEB) to the policy makers • Promote the value of sustainable livelihood activities from biodiversity for local communities to policy makers • Encourage public/private partnerships to supplement national budgets, provide incentives, national biodiversity accounting included in GDP, payment for environment services (ecosystem services) • Consists in putting pressure on politicians for environment issues, mass public awareness campaign for public (general)
Environment given low priority by government	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lack of evidence of value of nature • Lack of awareness and understanding 	Prioritise building the evidence case on value of ESS and disseminate: people need to know and include these in important policy documents (e.g. Norway)
Lack of understanding among ministries	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Don't relate BD with their work 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Awareness raising at different levels through education, campaign, training soon • Valuation on BD
Competing priorities	Lack of understanding on the functions of ecosystems and their values	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Valuation tools • NBSAP • Improve knowledge base • Efficient implementation
Getting sectors to mainstream biodiversity into budgets	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Biodiversity value not considered • Not sectors priority • Not bringing sectors together 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • "Helping sectors help themselves": give them concrete information they need to mainstream biodiversity (e.g.. Guidelines,

Problems in mobilizing resources	Causes	Solutions
		values) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Awareness of biodiversity values (economic) • Valuation studies and economic assessment, BUT technical capacity needed for this
Ceiling in the budget for each ministry is fixed annually, disregarding the activities that will be carried out	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Despite MoE proposal/planning, the Ministry of Finance does the final allocation, leading to many activities having to be discarded 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Developing long-term financing strategy (e.g. 10 years) by MoE • Send the right people to negotiation with MoFinance • Support arguments with monetary valuation of benefits of ESS • Result oriented management (objective -> actions -> financing needs) • Financing going to other sectors should include conditionalities relating to environment
Technical capacity and expertise		
Technical capacity for translating innovative mechanisms into practice (also external)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Need to revert from old systems / requires changes • Very technical require scientific knowledge • Lack of examples and lessons and experience to share from • Lack of new skills needed 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Forum for sharing experiences, lessons with case studies, biodiversity specialists and economic planners for both „selection“ and „implementation“ – CBD secretariat, UN partners
Lack of capacity of experts and sufficient experts for resource mobilization	Lack of comprehension and understanding of the technical language used Lack/poor awareness (flyers to all levels) Translate biodiversity language for a better understanding (of the complexity)	Environmental education Dissemination of information (media, theatre, flyers, etc.) Integrated short courses – to public in general <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Capacity building for resources to mobilise • Sharing of information (south-south cooperation)
Resource mobilization requires time investment, so less time to “do”	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No “one window” • Many disparate sources (potential) with different requirements 	Identify internal expertise for fund-raising/fund access, partners
No dedicated structures: therefore don't know how to access sources and what's available		

Problems in mobilizing resources	Causes	Solutions
Delays in payment of funds		
Constant delays in payment of funds delaying realisation by several years, need to update project budget	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lack of national contribution • Internal accountability (of multilateral agencies) • Do not respect their commitments • Favouring of certain countries • Lack of transparency in internal procedures 	Even modest national contribution can solve range of difficulties above (e.g. timing)
Engaging the private sector		
Inability to engage private sector, make business case and communicate	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Hard to take biodiversity case to them in business/economic language • Science-business interface • Different priorities • Business doesn't see the benefit to them in biodiversity conservation (vs. social investment e.g. in schools) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Public recognition for good biodiversity work/business-biodiversity awards • Develop engagement strategy • Arms-length trust fund dedicated to conservation
Private sector not involved in BD matters/state agencies don't know how to ask/what	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Unclear national priorities • Unclear benefits for private sector 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Close the gap between humans and BD (make clear the social benefits) • Valuation of BD and ESS • Comprehension of complex mechanisms linked to BD (integral vision) and translate to simpler language
