



## Convention on Biological Diversity

Distr.  
GENERAL

UNEP/CBD/WS/NBSAP/RPCB/1  
13 December 2013

ORIGINAL: ENGLISH

GLOBAL WORKSHOP ON REVIEWING  
PROGRESS AND BUILDING CAPACITY FOR  
THE NATIONAL BIODIVERSITY STRATEGIES  
AND ACTION PLANS REVISION PROCESS  
Nairobi, Kenya, 11-15 November 2013

### REPORT OF THE GLOBAL WORKSHOP ON REVIEWING PROGRESS AND BUILDING CAPACITY FOR THE NATIONAL BIODIVERSITY STRATEGIES AND ACTION PLANS REVISION PROCESS



/...

In order to minimize the environmental impacts of the Secretariat's processes, and to contribute to the Secretary-General's initiative for a C-Neutral UN, this document is printed in limited numbers. Delegates are kindly requested to bring their copies to meetings and not to request additional copies.

## INTRODUCTION

1. The global workshop on reviewing progress and building capacity for the National Biodiversity Strategies and Action Plans (NBSAPs) was held from 11 to 15 November 2013 in Nairobi, Kenya, with the generous support of the Japan Biodiversity Fund and the European Union. This workshop was convened in response to decision X/2 which urges Parties and Governments to revise and update their NBSAP, and report thereon to the twelfth meeting of the Conference of the Parties in 2014. It also follows up on decision XI/2 which requests the Executive Secretary to continue to promote and facilitate, in partnership with relevant organizations, activities to strengthen implementation of the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020 and the Aichi Biodiversity Targets at the national, sub-regional and regional levels. In the latter regard, the workshop also focused attention on the NBSAP Forum, a mechanism developed jointly by SCBD, UNEP-WCMC and UNDP and initially launched at COP 11, intended to support countries in activities related to NBSAP revision.

2. Participants at the workshop were primarily the National GEF-EA Project Coordinators. Members of the NBSAP Forum also provided additional support, in delivering thematic modules, serving as resource persons and contributing to side events. The final list of participants, including resource persons is posted on the Convention's website at: <https://www.cbd.int/nbsap/workshops/global/default.shtml>

3. The programme of the workshop, contained in Annex I, consisted of modules developed in relation to three major themes (Resource Mobilization and Valuation, Mainstreaming, and National Target Setting), focusing on aspects of NBSAP planning and development that have been identified as the most in need of capacity-building and technical support. Participants were divided into five UN language groups. In addition, one half-day session featured a 'Project Management Clinic' for the purpose of troubleshooting issues related to UNDP and UNEP GEF project management. During the workshop, an informal self-evaluation of progress with NBSAP revision was undertaken and the results are summarised in Annex II. Presentations made during the workshop and at side events, as well as the results of the workshop performance evaluation, are also available on the Convention's website at <https://www.cbd.int/nbsap/workshops/global/default.shtml>. Activities carried out in the sessions conducted under each of the workshop themes are summarized below.

## OPENING OF THE WORKSHOP

4. Mr. Ibrahim Tiaw, UNEP Deputy Executive Director, speaking on behalf of Mr. Achim Steiner, UNEP Executive Director, opened the global workshop welcoming all participants to UNEP Headquarters and stressing the importance of revised National Biodiversity Strategy and Action Plans as one contribution towards the transition to sustainable development underway through the SDG negotiations and other fora. The Government of Kenya, represented by Mr. Richard Mwendandu, Director of MEAs, speaking on behalf of the Cabinet Secretary for Environment, welcomed participants to Kenya and briefly described some of the measures that Kenya is putting in place to mainstream biodiversity into different sectors of the economy. The Japanese Government, represented by H.E. Mr. Tatsushi Terada, Permanent Representative to UNEP, described the evolution of national biodiversity planning in Japan through five iterations of their NBSAP, and emphasized the continuing support Japan is providing to developing countries through the Japan Biodiversity Fund. Mr Atsuhiko Yoshinaka, representing the CBD Executive Secretary, Mr. Bráulio Ferreira de Souza Dias, reminded participants of how difficult the past three years had been in terms of global economic shocks, among other matters, but urged all Parties to make every effort to meet the commitments made at the tenth and eleventh meetings of the Conference of the Parties. Following the opening statements, a presentation was made by Ms. Jamison Ervin (UNDP) to launch the website of the NBSAP Forum, after which those Forum institutional partners and members present as resource persons (Birdlife International, IUCN, UNEP-WCMC, UNEP-DELC, CMS) made brief supporting statements. Finally, a brief introduction/overview was provided for each of the major themes of the workshop by SCBD staff.

## SUMMARY OF ACTIVITIES BY WORKSHOP THEME

### Resource Mobilization and Valuation

5. The module on resource mobilization and valuation consisted of two separate half-day sessions. A first session considered the critical importance of identifying and assessing the manifold values of biodiversity and associated ecosystem services, and integrating them into national plans, policies, and reporting systems, as a critical precondition for the more effective mobilization of resources. The second session considered tools and associated work to identify and assess existing biodiversity-related expenditures, thus enabling the establishment of robust financial baselines and effective reporting, and to develop national finance plans or national resource mobilization strategies for the effective implementation of revised NBSAPs. The second session also provided an overview on recent trends in international funding, with particular emphasis on the pertinent framework of the European Union.

6. The first session, on integrating values of biodiversity, featured two important work streams undertaken by the United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP). Ms Cristina Secades (UNEP-WCMC) presented the results of a recently concluded project that examined how the values of biodiversity can be taken up and integrated into (revised) NBSAPs (i.e. which institutional, administrative, legal, and financial arrangements and measures could be foreseen in NBSAPs as critical steps towards the mainstreaming of such values). Relying on a wealth of country-level information assembled through this project, she presented a number of critical lessons learned and pointed to a number of good practice examples, based on a sample of case studies prepared under the project.<sup>1</sup>

7. Mr. Nicolas Bertrand (UNEP coordinating office for the Economics of Ecosystems and Biodiversity (TEEB) initiative), presented the main outcomes of this international initiative and its recent work under 'TEEB phase III', which includes ongoing in-depth exploration of the issue in specific sectors (water, marine, agriculture), as well as the preparation of 'national TEEB studies' or related initiatives in various countries. Highlighting the economic importance of biodiversity and ecosystem services can be pivotal in raising awareness among policy-makers and decision-makers and in shifting political priorities, and a critical precondition for the more effective mobilization of resources.<sup>2</sup>

8. Participants shared, in their respective language group, pertinent work undertaken at the national level and associated experiences and lessons learned. Formal presentations were provided as follows.

9. Mr. Somanegré Nana (Burkina Faso) presented work undertaken by Burkina Faso on valuation and ecosystem accounting, as well as recent institutional and policy measures taken to strengthen the economic case for biodiversity and ecosystem services.

10. Ms. Nona Khelaia and Ms. Natia Kobakhidze (both from Georgia) presented the main results of a recently concluded TEEB scoping study in Georgia and how pertinent measures are being reflected in the NBSAP revision process.

11. Ms. Anita James (St. Lucia) presented valuation work undertaken by St. Lucia and provided an update on the planned TEEB scoping study and how its result will feed into, and interact with, the revised NBSAP.

12. During the second session, Mr. Markus Lehmann (CBD Secretariat) presented the recent work under the Convention on resource mobilization, as well an overview on the adoption of the Strategy for Resource Mobilization, and of a suite of global resource mobilization targets, by the ninth and eleventh meetings of the Conference of the Parties, respectively. He provided an explanation on the use of the preliminary framework for reporting against achievement of these targets by countries<sup>3</sup>, noting also the close linkage and interaction with public expenditure review (a core tool in the methodology provided by the UNDP BIOFIN project).

---

1/ [http://www.unep-wcmc.org/guidance-for-incorporating-biodiversity-and-ecosystem-service-values-into-nbsaps\\_1026.html](http://www.unep-wcmc.org/guidance-for-incorporating-biodiversity-and-ecosystem-service-values-into-nbsaps_1026.html)

2/ <http://www.teebweb.org/>

3/ <http://www.cbd.int/doc/notifications/2013/ntf-2013-050-preliminary-reporting-framework-en.xls>

13. Ms. Jamison Ervin (UNDP) presented an overview of the objectives of, and work undertaken by, the UNDP BIOFIN project, and subsequently introduced two core tools provided by the BIOFIN workbook: a simplified template for undertaking a review of private and public biodiversity-related expenditures, with a view to developing a robust financial baseline against which funding gaps, needs, and priorities can be identified and reported; as well as structured guidance on the development of national finance plans as a central means to close these funding gaps, including on the various options (i.e. financial tools) available to close such gaps.

14. Participants shared their national experiences and challenges in mobilizing resources for implementation of biodiversity policies. Formal presentations thereon were provided by Mr. Khaled Allam Harhash (Egypt), Mr. Muratbek Mazhubayev (Kazakhstan), and Ms. Roxana Solis Ortiz (Peru).

15. In a joint presentation on international funding, Ms. Anna Drutschinin (OECD Development Cooperation Directorate) and Mr. Thierry Lucas (UNEP Brussels Liaison Office) provided an overview of the international funding landscape, with emphasis on the EU Multi-annual Financial Framework (MFF). Ms. Drutschinin provided pertinent data and information collected by the OECD Development Assistance Committee (DAC) through its Creditor Reporting System including the 'Rio Markers'. She also provided the link to the pertinent online database<sup>4</sup>, noting that this database is a useful tool for getting an overview on international (bilateral) sources of funding in a country and, subsequently, for identifying potential funding opportunities.

16. Mr. Lucas provided a detailed overview of the different funding windows under the EU Multi-annual Financial Framework (MFF), tailored to the audiences of the different language groups. He noted that, while funding opportunities under explicit biodiversity or environment umbrellas may appear to be limited, important indirect entry points can be found in other areas, including poverty alleviation and sustainable development, more generally, as well as in areas covered by sectoral programmes on, for example, food security and sustainable agriculture.

17. In break-out groups, participants considered: (i) opportunities to strengthen the integration of biodiversity values in the NBSAP currently under revision; (ii) key challenges or key opportunities for the more effective mobilization of financial resources; and (iii) opportunities for introducing or up-scaling a range of financial instruments.

18. The topic led to lively discussions in the respective language groups, ranging from fundamental or conceptual considerations to the pragmatic nuts-and-bolts of accessing funds. The discussions also reflected, to a considerable extent, regional conditions and peculiarities. However, a number of common themes strongly emerged across all language groups. For instance, the presence of political will (or the absence thereof) was very highly prioritized by all language groups. This issue poses a key challenge for most countries, but is also regarded as an opportunity by some. Many interventions stressed that identification and assessment of the values of biodiversity, and associated ecosystem services, could serve as an important vehicle to more effectively garner attention and raise awareness among policy-makers and decision-makers. Particular interest was expressed by many participants on the issue of identification and quantification of economic values. Strengthening of related technical capacity on economic valuation methodologies, as well as the availability of technical support in undertaking economic valuation studies, were highlighted as important needs.

19. However, it was also emphasized that, in line with the multi-faceted values of biodiversity, which include many non-economic values, such as ecological, social, and spiritual values, work on economic values should not lead to a narrow focus on commercial benefits or to a biased policy response, and the appropriate approach towards the assessment of values would need to be taken in accordance with national circumstances and priorities. In this context, it was also highlighted that the mobilization of resources should not be restricted to financial resources, as such a restrictive approach would risk neglecting the importance of non-financial resources. The role of indigenous and local communities acting as traditional biodiversity stewards was pointed out as an example of where mobilized non-financial resources are significant, if not decisive.

---

4/ <http://www.oecd.org/dac/stats/rioconventions.htm>

20. The role of powerful interest groups and the issue of institutional coordination and alignment, including and, in particular, among government entities, were highlighted as other important enabling factors for resource mobilization. These issues were again identified mainly as challenges, but sometimes also as opportunities. As an example for the latter, participants noted that international stakeholders that become active in the country will sometimes bring a set of internal regulatory requirements, such as on environmental impact assessment, which can be used as a lever by national players to achieve more stringent domestic environmental outcomes. In this sense, it was stated that the engagement and active involvement of all relevant stakeholders are critical, and that this can sometimes also open up new sources of funding. At the same time, some participants emphasized that governments continue to play a central role and, because of their inherent power, can often achieve much with comparatively little financial resources.

### **Mainstreaming**

21. The mainstreaming theme was organized in a way that would maximize the sharing of experiences among country participants. After a round of introductions and an opening presentation by the CBD Secretariat to introduce the topic, and introductions of resource people, participants were given the choice of specific discussion topics and exercises to do during group work and in plenary. Among the choices were: (i) Getting a better understanding of the meaning and tools for mainstreaming; (ii) Addressing mainstreaming in a specific sector group; (iii) Gender mainstreaming; and (iv) Working with the Mainstreaming Rapid Diagnostic Tool. Each of these options was supported by resource people from UNDP, UNEP, UNEP-WCMC, IUCN, Birdlife International, and/or OECD.

22. In addition to these topics, the discussions in plenary addressed key areas of mainstreaming, such as its many meanings, information/data, institutional mechanisms and strategies, entry points, land use planning, SEA, how to ensure implementation, identifying opportunities and prioritizing sectors for mainstreaming, monitoring mainstreaming, systemic versus punctual mainstreaming, stakeholder involvement (other ministries, civil society, etc.), relationship with protected areas, sub-national strategies, among others.

23. Initially there was some confusion over what exactly was meant by mainstreaming, as it is a term that is used in so many ways, in part because of its ample scope (if it is defined broadly), and that has been given so much importance as something crucial that has to be achieved in order to implement the Convention successfully. As the discussions progressed, many acknowledged that they had made and continue to make substantial efforts towards mainstreaming and have made progress in some areas. Important challenges remain for making significant further progress, particularly with cross-sectoral and/or national level policies, plans, and programmes.

24. There were numerous examples of institutional mechanisms established for mainstreaming such as the establishment of “biodiversity cells” in different governmental ministries (in certain countries in West Africa), the establishment of inter-sectoral committees, and the creation of special commissions comprising a range of stakeholders to work on specific issues. Many of these mechanisms have been key to ensuring inter-ministerial dialogue and have been established following the passing of national biodiversity laws that provide for their creation.

25. Many participants explained how they are taking advantage of emerging opportunities such as the updating of rural, urban and regional development plans, climate change plans, poverty reduction strategies, specific sectoral plans, etc. to try to integrate biodiversity into them. The importance of providing planners and decision makers in other sectors with information that is useful (and interesting) to them was highlighted. A key recurring discussion topic was the role of information and its use in mainstreaming efforts. The discussions included considerations of the access to and existence of pertinent information, with several countries stating that their revised NSBAP will include actions to fill national data gaps. Several participants explained that they have established partnerships with universities and research centres in their countries, in order to have a channel through which to request research on specific areas where there are gaps, and in order to get access to data.

26. Several of the language groups discussed gender mainstreaming either in groups or in plenary. Although, in general, progress on gender mainstreaming in the NBSAP is very low, there were few countries

in every working group that shared information regarding their progress in this area. Some of the main challenges that participants identified included a lack of knowledge of what gender mainstreaming is and how it can be done in their countries, the lack of gender experts and/or social scientists in the NBSAP team, small degree of inter-institutional work with social ministries and institutions, lack of information on gender and biodiversity linkages at the country level, lack of awareness of the need to mainstream gender considerations because of the existence of national laws to promote gender equality. Among the lessons learned, participants mentioned the need to go beyond including the right words, the importance of linking with civil society organizations with experience in this area, the importance of disaggregated data, importance of having gender goals, actions and indicators in the NBSAPs, among others.

27. Several of the country groups reflected on the long-term nature of mainstreaming, involving relationship-building and institutional (and paradigm) change, versus the relatively short time left to complete NBSAPs in time to meet the deadline set in Aichi Target 17. It was concluded that mainstreaming efforts should be continuous, going beyond even the timeframes of NBSAPs. The question emerged as to how to reflect these ongoing efforts in NBSAPs and National Reports, with some participants suggesting that mainstreaming targets, and specific initiatives and actions could be included and reported in NBSAPs and National Reports, while much of the political work (networking, relationship-building, advocacy, awareness-raising) that is necessary for mainstreaming goes undocumented.

28. All in all, the discussions held were extremely rich reflecting the detailed knowledge and experience of the participants in different aspects of mainstreaming. In conclusion, it can be said that countries have a lot of experiences in this area; many are not documented, nor complete (in the sense of having a beginning and an end and, importantly, concrete impacts) but are specific actions, with their successes and failures, in broad, disparate, and oftentimes unplanned processes on biodiversity mainstreaming. There are also very many experiences of small-scale mainstreaming into specific projects, policies, area plans, and/or sectoral actions. There are very few examples of national, cross-sectoral mainstreaming, with those that do exist being mostly attributable to the political will of leaders. There were few, or no, examples shared in the workshop of success deriving from the mainstreaming efforts of the CBD NFP, the environment ministry or other biodiversity actors. There have been some important successes, with some participants asserting that what a few years ago was “unthinkable” is happening now; however, mainstreaming remains a major challenge for almost all countries.

### **Targets and Indicators**

29. This session dealt with the translation of the global Aichi Biodiversity Targets, adopted by the tenth meeting of the Conference of the Parties in Nagoya in October 2010, into national targets compatible with NBSAP priorities.

30. These sessions were facilitated by Mr. David Duthie (CBD Secretariat), assisted by Mr. Philip Bubb (UNEP-WCMC), Mr. Ademola Ajagbe (BirdLife International), in addition to Ms. Olivia Adhiambo (Birdlife International) for some sessions, and Mr. Ben Skolnik (Alliance for Zero Extinction (AZE)).

31. The sessions were presented in each of the 5 language streams (FR, RU, AR, EN, SP<sup>5</sup>), with the latter (SP) facilitated by Mr. Philip Bubb and Mr. Ben Skolnik, and run in parallel with the English group which was facilitated by Mr. David Duthie (SCBD), with support from Mr. Will Banham (UNEP-WCMC) and Mr. Ademola Ajagbe (BirdLife International).

32. Each session began with a similar agenda, as follows:

- (i) A quick tour-de-table on the current status of national target-setting in the participating countries;
- (ii) An introductory overview presentation (EN) made by SCBD, followed by questions and answers;

---

5/ FR=French; RU=Russian; AR=Arabic; EN=English; SP=Spanish



- (iii) Additional presentations on the role of the Biodiversity Indicators Partnership (UNEP-WCMC); area-based target-setting (AZE) (EN, SP) and BirdLife International (EN);
- (iv) A series of three group exercises were undertaken, if time permitted, in small working groups. The group exercises used, in all five languages, are available at: <https://www.cbd.int/doc/nbsap/nbsapcbw-global-01/nbsap-nairobi-scbd-group-exercises.pdf>

Country-specific presentations (below) were made in different language streams. All workshop presentations are available at: <https://www.cbd.int/nbsap/workshops/global/default.shtml>.

- Brazil - Building the Brazilian Strategy for 2020
- Cameroun - SPANDB, cibles nationaux, indicateurs
- Egypt - National Biodiversity Planning to support the implementation of Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020 in Egypt; Proposal for types of data needed for the NBSAP
- Perú - Proceso de actualización de la Estrategia Nacional de Diversidad Biológica al 2021 y elaboración del Plan de Acción Nacional para la Biodiversidad 2014-2018

33. From the tour-de-table conducted in each language stream, and review of the NBSAP progress “self-assessments” (see Table 1), it is clear that some progress is being made towards establishing national targets however less than 25% of responding countries have completed the process.

34. One point emerging from the discussion was the need for the development of strategic priorities and national targets to be an iterative process, requiring several rounds of development as both priorities and targets are refined during overall strategy development.

**Table 1: Level of Progress on NBSAP revision (% of responding countries) as of 15 November 2013**

	None	Just started	Some progress	Some outputs	Completed
<b>Setting national targets</b>	17	15	21	23	23

35. The overview presentation generated a good deal of discussion in all language streams and can hopefully serve as the basis for similar presentations and discussions at the national level.

36. A key issue emerging from the discussions was the need for national targets to be SMART (Specific, Measurable, Ambitious (but Achievable), Realistic and Time-bound), thus requiring them to be clearly linked to indicators for which adequate time series data exist, to both establish a baseline and to measure progress towards targets.

37. The first of the three group exercises focused on identifying the information needs (indicators) for potential targets and comparing this with the reality of information existing at the national level, and identifying which institution(s) might be the “custodians” of such data.

38. A very useful directory of a comprehensive biodiversity planning dataset was demonstrated by Mr. Khaled Allam Harhash (Egypt) and included in his presentation (EN), along with a list of websites offering different sets of biodiversity information as open access.

39. Another potentially useful resource in this regard is the indicator list generated through the CBD Strategic Plan for Biodiversity (2011-2020) process (see: <http://www.cbd.int/sp/indicators/>).

40. A second key point emerging from the discussions and linked to the second and third group exercises was the issue of the number of national targets to be adopted, and also whether national targets should be based “one-on-one” on the global Aichi Biodiversity Targets or not and, if not, how to map national targets back to the relevant Aichi Targets.

41. Discussion focused on the difference between scientific (evidence-based) versus political processes for the development and adoption of national targets, with a key lesson emerging that the role of biodiversity planners should be to use expert consultations, [Delphi techniques](#), etc. to compile the best available scientific and technical information to develop: “*defensible products for use by decision-makers*”<sup>6</sup>, including SMART targets.

42. A (growing) database of national targets set by Parties since 2010, including those with revised NBSAPs that aim to be consistent with the global Strategic Plan for Biodiversity (2011-2020) is available at: <https://www.cbd.int/nbsap/targets/default.shtml>, including three examples (France, Japan and Switzerland) where Parties have mapped their national targets to specific global Aichi Biodiversity Targets.

43. From the group discussions, it is clear that national target-setting remains a significant challenge to many Parties, and also that there is not “quick and easy” way to develop SMART targets that policy-makers will adopt and that all stakeholders will engage with during implementation. During the workshop, it also became clear that target-setting is a “shared commitment” and that there is much to be gained from horizontal and vertical exchange of thinking about, and draft versions of, national targets and indicator sets before they are finally submitted for approval as part of a revised NBSAP, in line with the timelines adopted at COP 10, thus contributing to the early achievement of global Aichi Biodiversity Target 17: “*By 2015 each Party has developed, adopted as a policy instrument, and has commenced implementing an effective, participatory and updated national biodiversity strategy and action plan*”.

### CLOSING OF THE WORKSHOP

44. The closing plenary of the workshop was convened at 3 p.m. on Friday, 15 November 2013. This short ceremony started with a presentation from Mr. Kent Nnadozie (FAO International Treaty on Plant Genetic Resources for Food and Agriculture), outlining the ways in which the Treaty can contribute to mainstreaming of biodiversity into the agriculture sector and generate benefits for local communities through the development and sharing of plant genetic resources in sustainable agriculture<sup>7</sup>. Following this, a brief summary of project management clinics and next steps for the GEF NBSAP revision projects was made by Ms. Jamison Ervin and Ms. Ether Mwangi, on behalf of UNDP and UNEP, respectively. This was followed by a summary of the work of the three major working themes of the workshop made by Mr. Markus Lehmann, Ms. Nadine Saad and Mr. David Duthie of the CBD Secretariat, for the themes of resource mobilisation and valuation, mainstreaming, and targets and indicators, respectively. Finally, after a few interventions from national participants and ILC representatives to express their satisfaction with the workshop and to stress the need for continued efforts to improve broad stakeholder engagement in NBSAP revision and implementation, the meeting was closed with a statement made by Mr. Hassan Saad Hassan, on behalf of the Principal Secretary for Planning of the Kenyan Ministry of Devolution and Planning. The meeting finished at 4:30 p.m.

---

6/ A quote from: Reyers, B. et al (2009) Developing products for conservation decision-making: lessons from a spatial biodiversity assessment for South Africa. *Diversity and Distributions*, 13 (5):608-619; URL: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1472-4642.2007.00379.x>

7/ This presentation was to part of the opening plenary but was delayed due to other FAO ITPGRFA commitments.



## Annex I

## PROGRAMME OF THE WORKSHOP

	Monday (Nov.11)	Tuesday (Nov.12)	Wednesday (Nov. 13)	Thursday (Nov. 14)	Friday (Nov. 15)
<b>10:00 – 13:00</b>	<b>Plenary Room: CR 1</b>  Opening statements  Expanding Partnerships for NBSAPs  MEA Synergies  NBSAPs and the CBD Protocols  Overview of the workshop sessions <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Resource mobilization</li> <li>• Mainstreaming</li> <li>• Targets and Indicators</li> </ul>	<b>RESOURCE MOBILIZATION AND VALUATION</b>  Integrating values into NBSAP: results of the UNEP/WCMC Project  TEEB Phase III: update on national TEEB studies and their linkages with the NBSAP revision  Integrating values into NBSAP: country experiences  Group work	<b>MAINSTREAMING II</b>  Individual/Group work - Next steps in my mainstreaming effort  Feedback and discussion of next steps	<b>Project Management Clinic</b>  Time when UNDP and UNEP GEF Project Management is available for troubleshooting	<b>TARGETS AND INDICATORS</b>  Group work on SMART target setting  Group work on mapping national targets to global Aichi Targets  Feedback  Conclusions and next steps
<b>13:00 – 15:00</b>	Lunch / Side-events	Lunch / Side-events	Lunch / Side-events	Lunch / Side-events	Lunch
<b>15:00 – 18:00</b>	<b>RESOURCE MOBILIZATION AND VALUATION</b>  Work on resource mobilization under the Convention  Transforming biodiversity finance  Applications of BIOFIN methodology at national level  The international funding landscape, emphasis on the EU Multiannual Financial Framework	<b>MAINSTREAMING I</b>  Introduction and Overview of Mainstreaming Session  Group work: Mainstreaming progress to date, challenges and lessons  Feedback and discussion on what works in mainstreaming and assessment of group work findings	Free time for informal meetings as needed, etc.	<b>TARGETS AND INDICATORS</b>  Introduction and Overview of Targets and Indicators Module  Target setting as a process  Targets – AZE and BirdLife experience  Tour de Table on status of target setting status process  Group work on information requirements for Target setting	<b>Plenary Room: CR 1</b>  Housekeeping announcements  Reporting back from sessions <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Resource mobilization</li> <li>• Mainstreaming</li> <li>• Targets and Indicators</li> </ul> UNEP/UNDP Project Management Summary closing statements

**Annex II**  
**PROGRESS IN IMPLEMENTING NBSAPS**

<b>Progress in implementing NBSAPs (in percentage)</b> (Results based on about 50 participant responses)					
	LEVEL OF PROGRESS				
	None	Just started	Some progress	Some outputs	Complete
<b>Getting organized</b>					
1. Organizing logistics	0.00	15.09	13.21	28.30	43.40
2. Taking stock	3.77	9.43	26.42	30.19	30.19
<b>Engaging and communicating with stakeholders</b>					
3. Identify relevant stakeholders	3.77	7.55	18.87	26.42	43.40
4. Develop communication and outreach plan	26.42	22.64	28.30	13.21	9.43
<b>Gathering information</b>					
5. Status and trends of biodiversity and ecosystem services	5.66	22.64	30.19	22.64	18.87
6. Linkages between biodiversity and society	5.66	20.75	32.08	26.42	15.09
7. Legal, institutional and policy environment	3.77	15.09	35.85	24.53	20.75
8. Biodiversity finance	16.98	30.19	26.42	16.98	9.43

9. Status of public awareness of biodiversity	11.76	19.61	27.45	35.29	5.88
10. Knowledge gaps	6.00	26.00	34.00	24.00	10.00
<b>Developing strategies and actions</b>					
11. Establishing national vision	11.32	16.98	16.98	28.30	26.42
12. Setting national targets	17.31	15.38	21.15	23.08	23.08
13. Identify specific strategies	15.69	19.61	23.53	27.45	13.73
<b>Developing implementation and resource mobilization plans</b>					
14. Outline and prioritize specific actions to be taken to implement strategy	29.41	21.57	19.61	23.53	5.88
15. Develop resource mobilization plan	41.51	39.62	11.32	5.66	1.89
16. Ensure strategies and actions are fully incorporated into national policies, frameworks, laws and budgets	32.69	21.15	30.77	15.38	0.00
17. Finalize indicator set and develop monitoring plan for all targets and associated actions	38.46	26.92	23.08	7.69	3.85
18. Develop plan for Clearinghouse Mechanism	34.00	32.00	22.00	6.00	6.00
<b>Implementing NBSAP</b>					
19. Engage stakeholders in the implementation of agreed strategies and actions	34.00	22.00	20.00	20.00	4.00
20. Implement specific NBSAP strategies and actions	36.54	21.15	30.77	7.69	3.85

21. Mobilize domestic and international financial resources	47.06	25.49	23.53	3.92	0.00
<b>Monitoring and reporting</b>					
22. Develop Fifth National Report	20.41	42.86	26.53	10.20	0.00
23. Communicate results of implementation broadly	47.92	33.33	16.67	2.08	0.00
24. Review and adapt priorities	44.23	23.08	28.85	1.92	1.92

-----