

Template for submitting comments on the draft manual for Strengthening NBSAPs through Landscape Approaches (UNU)

Please submit comments by **26 May 2023** to the following email address: landscape_approaches_nbsaps@unu.edu (cc: secretariat@cbd.int)

Contact information	
Surname:	Eldred
Given Name:	Megan
Government (if applicable):	
Organization:	BirdLife International
Address:	David Attenborough Building, Pembroke Street
City:	Cambridge
Country:	UK
Postal Code:	CB2 3QZ
Phone Number (including country code):	+447722088227
E-mail:	Megan.eldred@birdlife.org
Please provide general comments on the draft manual below.	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Protected areas are part of the landscape matrix, they should not be separated from it. Though protected areas may/ will have individualized management plans, this guidance should acknowledge how these should be taken into account as part of a wider landscape approach. Understanding and incorporating areas of high biodiversity value are key within landscape scale approaches, so that prioritization can take place amongst multiple conservation and development objectives. The success of landscape approaches can be contingent on how such approach is able to embrace complexity and especially the power relations embedded in the land rights schemes and control of natural resources. The risk is of glossing over entrenched inequalities and structural obstacles to governing collaboratively a landscape, as a result participatory approaches are key. 	
Please provide other comments indicating the line number below.	
Line number	Comments
35-40	On the direct application of landscape approaches- this should be expanded to include/ acknowledge other stakeholders who are directly responsible for land management/ have land tenure i.e. including IPLCs, private landowners. NBSAPs should acknowledge the role these constituencies have in the landscape/ seascape.
44	ADD 'with Target 1 on spatial planning underpinning the need for landscape scale approaches to protecting biodiversity'

92-93	Change ‘primary and secondary vegetation’ for more relatable examples for landscape management (similar to those referred to in relation to seascapes) i.e. protected and conserved areas, crops, livestock, human settlements etc. or add an e.g. ‘areas of importance for biodiversity’ (to reflect T1 and T3) relating to primary vegetation to clarify.
103	‘Protected areas’ have various forms of management, as a result they are part of the matrix within the landscape, rather than outside of landscape approaches. Developmental and conservation priorities, with stakeholder engagement, also apply for protected areas.
109	Even those areas that are formally designated as protected areas are not necessarily effectively managed for conservation outcomes. Protected area outcomes are particularly susceptible to land use impacts in surrounding areas. T3 focuses on effective conservation outcomes.
115	ADD ‘A spatial plan considers how to achieve the multiple objectives required for nature and people from a limited area of land.’
Table from 189 Map Section Plan Section Monitor section	Map section: areas of high importance for biodiversity should also be included in landscape scale mapping. The WDKBAs can be used alongside the WDPA to assess the most important areas for conservation in a landscape. Plan section: the mention of participatory approaches in the ‘things to consider’ should be referenced. Monitor section: the list ‘these include’ reads as though all of these indicators are included in the GBF monitoring framework (and as such agreed by Governments), and they are not all, so this sentence should be amended to be clearer.
211	Finance / Treasury departments can also have a significant impact on the environment through their policies.
231-235	DELETE ‘regularly update’ ADD ‘are required to regularly update.’ There are also commitments under T1 and T21 to ‘participatory [...] spatial planning’ and ‘participatory management’ respectively and so the language should be strengthened to reflect these specific commitments to the engagement of stakeholders.
Table from 250	The current colour ramp used to indicate relevance of landscape approaches is a little bit subtle and not very accessible to those with colour blindness, suggest choosing a broader colour palette, for example, yellow through orange.
Table from 250 Target 1	Possible landscape-related indicators: Mapping of Key Biodiversity Areas to identify areas of high biodiversity importance.
Table from 250 Target 3	Possible indicators: Coverage key biodiversity areas by protected areas (as in both the KMGBF monitoring framework and the SDG Indicators)
Table from 250- Target 4	Needs to acknowledge the broader aspects of human induced extinction, besides human-wildlife conflict. Unintended impacts of infrastructure development and unsustainable use are also important.
Table from 250- Target 8	Possible indicator here to include cross-referencing with/inclusion of biodiversity in NDCs and ensuring synergistic approaches for multi-benefit outcomes and access to finance.

267	ADD 'important for the global persistence of biodiversity' AFTER 'priority areas that are'
271	There needs to be some indication of priority. It is more important that areas of highest importance for biodiversity are managed in consideration of landscape scale approaches than those areas were it is easier because there are fewer stakeholders etc.
277	Important to flag that all these biodiversity prioritisation exercises are ongoing and reliant on the most up to date data. These biodiversity assessments can be included in spatial planning exercises.
315	Sustainable Development Goal Indicators may also be applied here.
339	Include reference to nationally determined contributions (NDCs), national adaptation plans (NAPs), etc. to ensure synergistic approaches and cross-sectoral cooperation.