Ref.: SCBD/IMS/JMF/NVW/86292 18 December 2019

**N O T I F I C A T I O N**

**Follow-up invitation to participate in and/or contribute to the piloting and further development of a methodology for the voluntary peer review of national biodiversity strategies and action plans**

Dear Madam/Sir,

I refer to notifications [2017-012](https://www.cbd.int/doc/notifications/2017/ntf-2017-012-vpr-en.doc), [2017-036](https://www.cbd.int/doc/notifications/2017/ntf-2017-036-nbsap-en.pdf) and [2018-044](https://www.cbd.int/doc/notifications/2018/ntf-2018-044-nbsap-en.doc), in which Parties were invited to contribute to the process of piloting and further developing the methodology for a voluntary peer review mechanism (VPR) for national biodiversity strategies and action plans (NBSAPs), through participation as a reviewee and/or by nominating an NBSAP reviewer.

You will also recall that the Conference of the Parties, in [decision 14/29](https://www.cbd.int/doc/decisions/cop-14/cop-14-dec-29-en.pdf), welcomed the progress made in the development of the VPR mechanism, and the positive result from the pilot phase, and decided to include the VPR as an element of the multidimensional review approach under the Convention. In the same decision, the Executive Secretary was requested to further develop options to enhance review mechanisms, with a view to strengthening the implementation of the Convention, for consideration at the third meeting of the Subsidiary Body on Implementation (SBI) in May 2020.

I am pleased to inform you that the implementation of the VPR pilot phase continues to progress steadily. Montenegro and Sri Lanka, respectively, underwent reviews in 2017 and 2018. Uganda is the third Party to undergo a review, which is ongoing. Participating countries have expressed appreciation for this type of review mechanism, noting the value of undertaking this type of exercise for enhancing the degree of efficiency and effectiveness of actions taken towards implementation of the goals of the Convention and its Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020, including the Aichi Targets. The peer-to-peer learning component of the process has also been highlighted as an advantage by both the countries being reviewed and expert members of the review team.

I would encourage those countries who have not already contributed to this process to consider doing so either as a reviewee, or by nominating a reviewer, as further outlined below. Nominations should be submitted, as soon as possible, but **no later than 15 January 2020** (scanned and attached to an e-mail addressed to secretariat@cbd.int or faxed to +1 514 288 6588).
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***NBSAP reviewee:*** Nominations for participating as a reviewee should be accompanied by a duly filled form ([see Appendix 1](https://www.cbd.int/doc/nbsap/vpr-appendix-1.docx)). The eligibility of Parties to undergo a review will be based on the following criteria: (a) evidence of high-level government support for the voluntary peer-review process; (b) submission of the latest national report; (c) adoption of the latest NBSAP as a policy document or an advanced draft of an NBSAP or policy equivalents, under revision.

***NBSAP reviewers:*** Nominations for participating as a reviewer should be accompanied by a curriculum vitae, and should indicate experience in working on biodiversity management and implementation of the Convention on Biological Diversity, either within or in partnership with their national government. Preference will be given to nominees with experience in project monitoring and/or evaluation. Reviewers, in their individual capacity, will conduct the review of one or more countries and contribute to the further improvement of the methodology.

Further information on the VPR process is available on the Convention website at: <https://www.cbd.int/nbsap/vpr>.

I look forward to your participation in this process and thank you for your continued support for the work of the Convention.

Please accept, Madam/Sir, the assurances of my highest consideration.

Elizabeth Maruma Mrema

Acting Executive Secretary

Attachment

**Appendix 1**

**Preliminary scoping checklist for a Party volunteering for peer review**

In order to be considered for the Convention on Biological Diversity’s voluntary peer review process, a minimum set of information is required to enable the Secretariat and potential reviewing Parties to quickly assess the needs and priorities of the Party wishing to be reviewed.

The checklist is divided into three sections: (i) Pre-requisite information, (ii) Scoping and (iii) Progress and challenges.

Please complete the three parts of the checklist and return to [secretariat@cbd.int](mailto:secretariat@cbd.int).

**Pre-requisite information**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 1. Name of Party |  |
| 2. Contact Point within Country  (Name, Address, Telephone, Email) |  |
| 3. Level of endorsement of request to be reviewed |  |
| 4. Date of submission of latest national report (and number) |  |
| 5. Date of submission/adoption and language(s) of latest national biodiversity strategy and action plan (or equivalent) to the Secretariat |  |
| 6. Indicative date for initiation of review (including desk review) |  |
| 7. Have you familiarized yourself with the methodology of the CBD voluntary peer review process? |  |

**Scoping**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 8. Does your latest NBSAP take into account the current Strategic Plan? |  |
| 9. Does your latest NBSAP include measures to address the three Protocols to the Convention (Cartagena, Nagoya and Kuala Lumpur-Nagoya Supplementary)? |  |
| 10. Does the latest NBSAP include national targets? |  |
| 11. Are these national targets cross-linked to global Aichi Biodiversity Targets? |  |
| 14. Do the national targets have associated indicators? Are there associated baseline data?? |  |
| 15. In your latest national report has any quantitative self-assessment of NBSAP implementation been undertaken? |  |
| 16. Is there currently an active Biodiversity Committee or equivalent whose members can be available for interview (either remotely or in-country)? |  |
| 17. Please list the sectors where you feel that mainstreaming (integration) of biodiversity has been relatively successful, and also list those where more progress is required. |  |
| 18. Please list all subnational biodiversity strategy and action plans that have been developed, adopted and are under implementation. |  |
| 19. Please list (up to) five priorities areas of NBSAP revision and implementation that you would like to be considered in detail as part of the review process. |  |

**Progress and Challenges**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **PROGRESS AND CHALLENGES IN THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE CONVENTION ON BIOLOGICAL DIVERSITY** | |
| **In the list below, which is taken from the annex to** [**decision VIII/8**](http://www.cbd.int/decision/cop/default.shtml?id=11020)**, please use the checkboxes to rank the progress or difficulty you are experiencing with each of the issues for implementation of your latest NBSAP on a scale of 1 (very problematic) to 10 (good progress).** | |
| **Political/societal** | |
| Mainstreaming and integration of biodiversity issues into other sectors, including use of tools such as environmental impact assessments | 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 |
| Public participation and stakeholder involvement | 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 |
| Political will and support to implement the Convention on Biological Diversity | 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 |
| Political stability | 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 |
| Precautionary and proactive measures, causing reactive policies | 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 |
| **Institutional, technical and capacity-related** | |
| Institutional capacity | 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 |
| Human resources | 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 |
| Transfer of technology and expertise | 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 |
| Traditional knowledge | 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 |
| Adequate scientific research capacities to support all the objectives | 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 |
| **Accessible knowledge/information** | |
| Biodiversity and the corresponding goods and services it provides properly understood and documented. | 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 |
| Utilization of existing scientific and traditional knowledge | 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 |
| Efficiency of dissemination of information on international and national level | 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 |
| Public education and awareness at all levels. | 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 |
| **Economic policy and financial resources** | |
| Financial and human resources | 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 |
| GEF financing | 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 |
| Economic incentive measures | 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 |
| Benefit-sharing | 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 |
| **Collaboration/cooperation** | |
| Synergies at the national and international levels | 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 |
| Horizontal cooperation among stakeholders | 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 |
| Effective partnerships | 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 |
| Engagement of scientific community | 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 |
| **Legal/juridical impediments** | |
| Appropriate policies and laws | 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 |
| **Socio-economic factors** | |
| Poverty | 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 |
| Population pressure | 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 |
| Consumption and production patterns | 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 |
| Lack of capacities for local communities | 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 |
| **Natural phenomena and environmental change** | |
| Climate change | 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 |
| Natural disasters | 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 |