CBD

UNEP

Convention on Biological Diversity

Distr.
GENERAL

UNEP/CBD/CBW-NBSAP/SEASI/2/2
7 June 2011

ORIGINAL: ENGLISH

REGIONAL WORKSHOP FOR EAST, SOUTH AND SOUTHEAST ASIA ON UPDATING NATIONAL BIODIVERSITY STRATEGIES AND ACTION PLANS
Xi'an, China, 9-16 May 2011

REPORT OF THE WORKSHOP

I. INTRODUCTION

1. In decision X/2, the Conference of the Parties to the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD) adopted the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020. In the same decision, the Conference of the Parties urged Parties and other Governments to develop national and regional targets, using the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020 as a flexible framework, and to review, update and revise, as appropriate, their national biodiversity strategies and action plans (NBSAPs) in line with the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020 and the guidance adopted in decision IX/9. The Conference of the Parties also urged Parties and other Governments to support the updating of national biodiversity strategies and action plans as effective instruments to promote the implementation of the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020 and to use the revised and updated NBSAPs as effective instruments for the integration of biodiversity targets into national development and poverty reduction policies and strategies, national accounting, economic sectors and spatial planning processes.

2. In the same decision, the Conference of the Parties also emphasized the need for capacity-building activities and the effective sharing of knowledge to support all countries, especially developing countries, in particular the least developed countries, small island developing States, and the most environmentally vulnerable countries, as well as countries with economies in transition, and indigenous and local communities, in the implementation of the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020.

3. In response, the Executive Secretary is organizing a series of regional or sub-regional workshops on updating NBSAPs in 2011 and 2012. The workshop for East, South and Southeast Asia was held in Xi'an, China from 9 to 16 May 2011 and was organized in collaboration with the Ministry of Environmental Protection of China, Shaanxi Province, Chanba Ecological District of the City of Xi'an and the 2011 Xi'an International Horticultural Exposition Executive Committee and with the generous financial support from the Government of Japan, the International Union for Conservation of Nature (IUCN), and the Mercuria Energy Group.

4. This workshop was supplemented with two additional days with a specific focus on valuation and incentive measures to facilitate implementation of targets 2 and 3 of the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020 as well as other related targets and decisions, and their translation into national targets and commitments.

/…

5. The specific objectives of the workshop were to:

(a) Facilitate national implementation of the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020, including by assisting Parties to develop national biodiversity targets in the framework of the Aichi Biodiversity Targets;

(b) Assist Parties in reviewing, updating, revising and implementing the national biodiversity strategy and action plan, with consideration given to how it can serve as an effective tool for mainstreaming biodiversity into broader national policies;

(c) Raise awareness to stimulate early actions to implement other Aichi-Nagoya outcomes, in particular, the Nagoya Protocol on Access and Benefit Sharing and the Nagoya-Kuala Lumpur Supplementary Protocol on Liability and Redress to the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety;

(d) Support countries in making use of the findings of the third edition of the Global Biodiversity Outlook (GBO-3) and the Economics of Ecosystems and Biodiversity (TEEB) study, and consider how the findings could be integrated into updated and revised NBSAPs;

(e) Facilitate active learning opportunities and peer-to-peer exchanges for National Focal Points and persons in charge of implementing and revising NBSAPs.

6. The workshop format featured a mix of presentations with questions and answer sessions, discussions in small working groups, interactive sessions to introduce relevant tools and a field study visit. At the beginning of each day, two participants were asked to summarize the main points of the previous day.

7. The workshop was attended by government-nominated officials responsible for the development and/or implementation of NBSAPs, and representatives from the development planning and finance ministries from: Bangladesh, Bhutan, Brunei Darussalam, Cambodia, China, India, Indonesia, Japan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Malaysia, Maldives, Mongolia, Myanmar, Nepal, Pakistan, the Philippines, the Republic of Korea, Singapore, Sri Lanka, Thailand, Timor Leste and Vietnam. Additionally, representatives from subnational governments and indigenous and local communities (ILCs) attended. Various resource persons from the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) Regional Centre for Asia, United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP) Regional Office for Asia and the Pacific, UNEP-WCMC, the United Nations University – Institute of Advanced Studies (UNU-IAS) International Partnerships for the Satoyama Initiative, ASEAN Centre for Biodiversity, Birdlife Asia, IUCN Economics Unit and the IUCN Communication and Education Commission, Chinese Academy of Sciences, Chinese Academy of Environmental Planning and the Indian Institute of Technology (Bombay) contributed their expertise in mainstreaming biodiversity, local implementation, stakeholders' engagement, communications, education and public awareness (CEPA), work with other Conventions, scientific and technical cooperation, resource mobilization, economic valuation and environmental accounting. The list of participants for the workshop can be accessed at https://www.cbd.int/nbsap/workshops2/seasi.shtml. The workshop was conducted in English with the exception of the opening session for which Chinese-English translation was provided.

8. This report provides an overview of the workshop agenda sessions, discussions, conclusions of the meeting, and the next steps to be undertaken. Annexes to this report present more detailed information on the outcomes of the workshop. The programme is presented in appendix I.

Field study visit and parallel events

9. A field study visit to Niubeiliang Protected Areas in Qinling Mountain was arranged by the Environment Department of Shaanxi Province on 12 May. The visit to this forest park exposed participants to different ecosystems and species existing in the Qinling Mountains which is a watershed dividing southern and northern China. Participants also learned about efforts undertaken by Shaanxi Province to protect unique ecosystems in Qinling.

10. In addition, as part of the field trip, participants also visited the Chanba Ecological District. An introduction was provided to participants as to how this district emerged from a waste disposal site in the past to a modern, ecologically-friendly district at present through activities to clean polluted water and dispose of municipal waste. This district also demonstrates how biodiversity can be integrated into urban planning.

11. In parallel with this workshop, the Ministry of Environmental Protection of China organized a national workshop on the development of local biodiversity strategies and action plans for 47 provincial and municipal government officials across China. The workshop urged all provinces and cities in China to develop local BSAPs by the end of 2012. The workshop provided an opportunity to exchange experiences in this regard and to expose local officials to international developments on these issues. Upon invitation, Mr. Markus Lehman (SCBD) introduced methods for economic valuation of biodiversity and the development of incentive measures. Mr. Lijie Cai (SCBD) outlined the outcomes of the Aichi-Nagoya meeting, including the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020 and the Plan of Action for Cities, Subnational Governments and other local authorities which offers suggestions on how local BSAPs can be developed. Mr. Gamini Gamage of Sri Lanka also provided comments on his country's experiences in developing regional and local biodiversity strategies.

12. On 14 May, the China Biodiversity Conservation and Green Development Foundation (CBCGDF), City of Xi'an and Shaanxi Province Environment Department organized an international forum on cities and biodiversity. A number of experts, including a participant from Singapore to this workshop, were invited to address biodiversity issues faced by cities. Mr. David Cooper made an introductory statement on behalf of the participants in the Asian NBSAP workshop. Ms. Linda Goh Mei Ee from Singapore shared experiences on Singapore's biodiversity conservation efforts as well as introduced and encouraged the use of the Singapore Index on Cities Biodiversity (CBI) as a monitoring tool to benchmark biodiversity conservation efforts at the local level.

II. SUMMARY OF PROCEEDINGS

ITEM 1. OPENING OF THE WORKSHOP

13. The workshop was opened on Monday, 9 May 2011. The opening ceremony was chaired by Mr. Wen Wurui, Director General of the Foreign Economic Cooperation Centre of the Ministry of Environmental Protection of China. He welcomed all participants to China and Xi'an and noted the importance of this workshop for biodiversity, and remarked also that the International Day for Biodiversity was approaching and that the United Nations had declared 2011-2020 as the Decade on Biodiversity. He further stated that Xi'an was hosting the 2011 International Horticultural Exposition on the theme of "cities and nature living in harmony". He stated that China had updated its national biodiversity strategy and action plan for the next two decades and was now promoting development of local biodiversity strategies and action plans, and that a national workshop on local biodiversity strategies and action plans will be held in parallel with this workshop at the same venue.

14. Mr. Zhu Guangqing, Deputy Director General of the Department of Nature Conservation of the Ministry of Environmental Protection of China, also welcomed participants to the workshop. He began by noting that the region was economically vibrant, culturally diverse and biodiversity-rich, and that remarkable economic growth and poverty reduction in the region in recent years should be attributed in part to the endowments and ecosystem services provided by Mother Nature. He also noted that striking a balance between social and economic development and biodiversity conservation and sustainable use was a huge challenge for the region. He stated that the organization of this workshop to help countries in the region develop strategies and policies to address this challenge was timely. The workshop would also provide a platform for countries to exchange experiences and lessons learned in the development and implementation of NBSAPs, as well as assist countries in upgrading their capacities to address biodiversity issues and implement the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020. He briefly highlighted the biodiversity facts of China and the work China has been doing since it adopted its first NBSAP in

1994. He also elaborated on activities that China had organized to celebrate the International Year of Biodiversity in 2010, noting that China had established a high-level national committee headed by Vice Premier Li Keqiang and that IYB activities played an important role in raising awareness of biodiversity issues in China. Moreover, China had updated its NBSAP for the next two decades. The new strategy contains 3 goals, 8 strategic tasks, 10 priority areas, 30 priority actions, 35 priority areas for conservation and 39 priority projects for implementation. The principles enshrined in this strategy are fourfold, namely "conservation being a first priority, sustainable use, public participation and benefit-sharing". Looking ahead, he said that China had adopted its 12th five-year plan which identified some major environmental and biodiversity targets and major programmes for ecological restoration. In addition, the Ministry of Environmental Protection had been promoting the integration of biodiversity into various sectoral and cross-sectoral plans and local plans for social and economic development. Through these activities, he believed that China could overcome challenges in the years ahead. Moreover, the United Nations Decade on Biodiversity provided an additional opportunity for all countries to work together to address biodiversity challenges. He concluded by thanking the Secretariat of the Convention on Biological Diversity for organizing the workshop and the local organizers for their support, and wished all participants a nice stay in Xi'an, a city blessed with rich historical heritage.

15. On behalf of the Executive Secretary of the Secretariat of the Convention on Biological Diversity, Mr. David Cooper thanked the Government of China, in particular the Ministry of Environmental Protection, Shaanxi Province, the Chanba District of the City of Xi'an and the Executive Committee of the 2011 International Horticultural Exposition for their strong support for the workshop. Referring to the statement by President Hu Jintao on the importance of building a resource-conserving and environmentally-friendly society, he stressed the importance of this for the entire region, which is home to the majority of the planet's biodiversity, and the need to mainstream biodiversity into the development processes across all sectors of government and society. He highlighted a number of recent moves made by China in this regard, including environmental and biodiversity targets identified by the recently-adopted 12th five-year plan for social and economic development as well as strategic goals adopted in an updated national biodiversity strategy and action plan. He also noted the appropriateness of the workshop being held in the city of Xi'an who is host to the 2011 International Horticultural Exposition whose theme is "nature and mankind-living in harmony" which coincides with the vision of the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020. He highlighted the key outcomes of the tenth meeting of the Conference of the Parties held in Nagoya, Japan last October, which included the adoption of the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020, the Nagoya Protocol on Access and Benefit-sharing and the Strategy for Resource Mobilization. He also mentioned that the United Nations General Assembly had declared 2011-2020 as the United Nations Decade on Biodiversity which provided important opportunities for countries to update their NBSAPs and translate the Aichi-Nagoya Outcomes into national targets and actions. He stressed the importance of revising NBSAPs and informed participants that Japan had established a Japan Biodiversity Fund to assist eligible countries in translating the Aichi Targets into national targets before COP-11 and that additional funds for national biodiversity planning had been made available through GEF-5. He also emphasized the importance of ratifying the Nagoya Protocol and the Nagoya-Kuala Lumpur Supplementary Protocol now opened for signature. He concluded by emphasizing the importance of the workshop to assist countries in setting targets and to develop strategies and actions to achieve the Aichi Biodiversity Targets, and he also called upon countries to demonstrate leadership, commitments and creative thinking to meet the great challenges ahead.

16. Mr. Li Jingxi, Deputy Director General of the Shaanxi Province Environment Department, stated that it was an honour to host the workshop in Xi'an, and noted the importance of the workshop for biodiversity conservation in the region. He highlighted the uniqueness of biodiversity in Shaanxi Province which was regarded as "a gene bank" in China. He stated that Shaanxi Province had adopted a regulation to protect ecosystems in Qinling which was considered to be an "important ecological area" in China. Shaanxi Province had also adopted regulations for plant protection and wetland conservation. As a result of these regulations, considerable progress had been made in biodiversity conservation in the province which had established more than 50 protected areas, 76 forest parks, 5 wetland parks and 2 botanical

gardens. He believed that the workshop would further promote biodiversity conservation in Shaanxi Province. He concluded by highlighting the rich cultural traditions and historical heritage of the province thus making it "one of the cradles of Chinese civilization", and extended his wishes to all participants for a successful workshop and pleasant stay in Xi'an.

17. Mr. Yuki Iwasa, Assistant Director of the Global Biodiversity Strategy Office of Nature Conservation Bureau of the Japanese Ministry of the Environment, speaking on behalf of the tenth meeting of the Conference of the Parties Presidency, first thanked the Government of China and the Secretariat of the Convention on Biological Diversity for organizing the workshop in Xi'an. He highlighted the key outcomes of the tenth meeting of the Conference of the Parties in Nagoya, Japan, particularly the Aichi Biodiversity Targets. He quoted the findings of the third edition of the Global Biodiversity Outlook, that the 2010 biodiversity targets had not been achieved, and emphasized the importance of adopting effective and concrete new targets. He said that it would be more important for all Parties to translate these global targets into national targets and actions and incorporate them into updated national biodiversity strategies and action plans. He believed that the United Nations Decade on Biodiversity would raise awareness of biodiversity issues and further enhance actions at international, national and local levels, which will contribute to the implementation of the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020. He reiterated Japan's commitment to assist Parties in developing and implementing their NBSAPs, by providing 2 billion USD in the next three years as announced by H.E. Mr. Naoto Kan, Prime Minister of Japan, at the high-level segment of the tenth meeting of the Conference of the Parties. He also mentioned that Mr. Ryu Matsumoto, the Japanese Environment Minister had announced the establishment of the Japan Biodiversity Fund to support the revising of national biodiversity strategies and action plans. He concluded by saying that this workshop provided a good opportunity for countries in the region to exchange information, strengthen understanding and regional cooperation towards achieving the Aichi Biodiversity Targets and the objectives of the Convention.

18. Mr. Yang Liuqi, Director of the Administrative Committee of Chanba Ecological District of the City of Xi'an, welcomed all participants to this ecological district. He noted that 2011 was a special year for this district as it hosts the 2011 International Horticultural Exposition. He said that cities would have an important role to play in transforming production patterns, reducing pollution, promoting low-carbon life and reducing use of resources, as human beings face challenges in the 21st century such as climate change, biodiversity loss and environmental degradation. He highlighted the theme of the Exposition which is "nature, mankind and cities-living in harmony". The theme was an expression of aspirations of city dwellers of nature, green development, low-carbon life and a green future. He concluded by saying that this workshop provided an opportunity for all human beings to meet future challenges together.

19. Mr. Lijie Cai facilitated self-introductions of the participants and asked them to focus on the extent to which they had been involved in the development and implementation of NBSAPs. The expectations are:

(a) To better understand the Aichi Targets & the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2010 and to learn about how to apply these for our NBSAP;

(b) To get clear guidance on revising NBSAPs, with linkage to financial mechanisms;

(c) To learn more about the financial support available to update NBSAPs/resource mobilization especially for implementing NBSAPs at the local level;

(d) To learn about how to develop indicators for each goal and target;

(e) To learn about experiences in monitoring and evaluation of NBSAPs;

(f) To learn about ways and means to integrate biodiversity targets into national planning processes;

(g) To learn about how to set targets and monitor them, which of the 20 targets we should focus on, given limited resources;

(h) To learn about how to implement the updated NBSAP;

(i) To address challenges in NBSAP implementation in a decentralized system;

(j) To strengthen capacities to develop a holistic and practical NBSAP in line with 2020 targets.

ITEM 2. REVIEW OF FINDINGS OF GBO-3 AND OVERVIEW OF THE AICHI-NAGOYA OUTCOMES

20. Mr. David Cooper presented an overview of the Aichi-Nagoya Outcomes: 47 decisions of the tenth meeting of the Conference of the Parties, including the Nagoya Protocol on ABS, the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020 and Aichi Targets, the Strategy for Resource Mobilization as well as the United Nations Decade on Biodiversity; 17 decisions of the Parties to the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety, including the Nagoya-Kuala Lumpur Supplementary Protocol and the Strategic Plan for Biosafety Protocol. In addition to all these, there were also declarations and parallel meetings on Local Authorities and Cities, Parliamentarians and Biodiversity and Development. He emphasized that the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020 adopted at the tenth meeting of the Conference of the Parties provided an overarching framework for all the work under the Convention. In providing a rationale for developing the Strategic Plan, he highlighted key findings from GBO-3 and other assessments that the global community had failed to achieve the 2010 target set by the World Summit on Sustainable Development (WSSD). The GBO and other assessments so far showed that biodiversity had been declining and pressures on biodiversity increased despite the fact that responses were increasing in general. He stressed that tipping points would have been reached if no action was taken, leading to severe losses of biodiversity and serious consequences for people. He quoted examples of Amazon dieback, eutrophication and coral reef collapse. He also referred to future scenarios for biodiversity in the 21st Century showing that a range of futures were possible, including futures that involved improvements in biodiversity and ecosystem services provided that bold action was taken.

21. On follow-up to the tenth meeting of the Conference of the Parties, Mr. Cooper introduced decision X/2 which outlined next steps for the implementation of the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020, and highlighted the importance of setting national and regional targets to achieve the Aichi Biodiversity Targets. The expectation is that by the eleventh meeting of the Conference of the Parties all the countries would have set their targets, and fully integrated them into updated NBSAPs. Finally he emphasized that the United Nations Decade on Biodiversity would enhance actions at various levels to achieve the Aichi Biodiversity Targets.

22. During the questions and answers, Pakistan emphasized that effective communication was very important for achieving targets within the Convention on Biological Diversity and Parties, so breakthroughs in this regard were needed. The representative from Timor-Leste noted that the 2020 targets were optimistic and there was a need for LDCs to have technical assistance and political support to achieve these targets, therefore he suggested that Convention on Biological Diversity communicate these targets to the high-level leadership so as to obtain their support to capacity-building and implementation. The representative from Singapore referred to target 2 (integrating biodiversity into poverty, national accounting) and the challenge in communicating figures to public agencies in dollar terms. One participant noted that TEEB could be used to raise awareness and political support. A representative from Indonesia noted that the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020 provided an overarching framework for all relevant Conventions, and countries needed to look at how to integrate biodiversity targets into plans or programmes of action for implementing various Conventions at various levels.

23. Mr. Yuki Iwasa, introduced the process and results of the assessment of the Japan Biodiversity Outlook (JBO) (from the late 1950s until 2010), progress made by Japan in achieving the 2010 targets and responses to biodiversity loss in the post-2010 period. He said that six ecosystems, including forests, marine and coastal systems and island systems, were included in the assessment, and four drivers or crises of change in biodiversity were identified including overexploitation, alien species and global warming.

The assessment indicated that biodiversity had been lost in every ecosystem and biodiversity loss was continuing, though some progress had been made, particularly in achieving targets 5.1 and 7.2. Based on the assessments, the JBO recommended possible responses to address biodiversity loss including development of methods and techniques to avoid negative impacts on biodiversity, promotion of sustainable use of local resources, large-scale wildlife management, conversion of secondary forests to natural forests, development of adaptation methods to climate change and enhancement of monitoring and management invasive alien species.

24. Ms. Clarissa Arida from the ASEAN Centre for Biodiversity introduced the ASEAN Biodiversity Outlook (ABO). She said that the ABO was an attempt to generate awareness on the status of biodiversity in the sub-region, the obstacles faced by countries in their efforts to conserve biodiversity and the next steps that have to be undertaken to fare better. The ABO recommended policy responses based on assessments of drivers of biodiversity loss, pressures on biodiversity and the state of biodiversity in the sub-region. While highlighting the importance of biodiversity of the sub-region in the world, she said that the ABO identified the drivers of biodiversity loss including habitat loss, climate change, overexploitation, pollution and poverty. The ABO also identified pressures on biodiversity for each of the drivers of change. For example, forest conversion, forest fires, marine and coastal habitats, modified through use of destructive fishing practices and infrastructure development, were identified as main pressures leading to habitat change/destruction. The assessment of the state of biodiversity in the subregion provided some important findings, including:

(a) Increasing per capita consumption of forest products;

(b) Decreasing forest area;

(c) Increasing trends in production and consumption of major agricultural commodity products;

(d) Decreasing trend in the size of mangrove areas all over Southeast Asia;

(e) 10% target for seagrass conservation in ASEAN was not met.

25. In preparing policy responses, ABO noted positive changes in the past years such as 98% increase in area of designated protected areas and 89% increase in number of protected areas and the establishment of the ASEAN Framework Agreement on Access and Benefit-sharing. Policy recommendations provided by ABO include:

(a) Sustaining current efforts on the ecosystem approach to biodiversity conservation;

(b) Sustaining the ASEAN Heritage Parks Programme;

(c) Engaging a greater number of biodiversity stakeholders in conservation initiatives and mainstreaming biodiversity into sectoral development plans;

(d) Valuing biodiversity and ecosystem services and translating biodiversity into economic terms;

(e) Engaging the private sector to invest in ecosystem services;

(f) Championing biodiversity, communicating and educating the society at large.

ITEM 3. REVIEW AND UPDATING OF NATIONAL BIODIVERSITY STRATEGIES AND ACTION PLANS: LESSONS LEARNED AND NEXT STEPS

26. Ms. Haruko Okusu from the UNEP Regional Office for Asia and the Pacific (ROAP) made a presentation on synergistic implementation of relevant MEAs. She began by noting that revision of NBSAPs provided a unique opportunity to consolidate all biodiversity-related issues across international/national obligations and various policy sectors, and that the NBSAP can be considered an umbrella framework to support implementation of all biodiversity-related MEAs by identifying

commonalities and synergistic programmes. She cited a few decisions from the Convention on Biological Diversity Conference of the Parties and findings from the UNU IAS reviews of NBSAPs that required synergies among biodiversity-related Conventions, and emphasized that the Aichi Biodiversity Targets were relevant to all biodiversity-related MEAs. She mentioned that some relevant Conventions were taking steps to follow up on the provisions of the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020. For example, the Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species of Wild Fauna and Flora (CITES) will adjust its strategic vision based on a review of the Strategic Plan; CITES and the Convention on Migratory Species (CMS) were working on guidance on incorporating relevant issues into NBSAPs and Ramsar COP will include CBD COP-10 outcomes in its deliberations. To make synergies possible, she suggested that countries take a few steps to this end, including liaising with focal points of other MEAs and identifying possible synergies with relevant programmes and cross-cutting issues.

27. Mr. Saw Leng Guan from Malaysia presented a review of implementation of the National Biodiversity Policy, noting that most of the Aichi Biodiversity Targets can find a home in the Malaysian Strategies. He also highlighted the weaknesses of the Malaysian Strategies, including lack of identification of actors responsible for the implementation of action plans, lack of timelines for implementation and indicators for measuring success and the need to strengthen coordination for implementation. He stated that Malaysia had taken steps since 1998 to address these weaknesses, including establishing a National Biodiversity-biotechnology Council (NBBC) to mainstream biodiversity into various sectors and incorporating biodiversity issues into the Malaysian five-year plans for development. He also said that Malaysia would review implementation of its Biodiversity Policy again in 2011-2012, with a view to internalize the Aichi Biodiversity Targets.

28. Mr. Gamini Gamage from Sri Lanka presented a review on NBSAP implementation. He highlighted some achievements in the implementation of the NBSAP as well as the weaknesses of the NBSAP and the challenges encountered in implementation. He shared thoughts about updating the NBSAP, including the development of some national targets and incorporating them into NBSAPs.

29. Mr. Rizwan Irshad from Pakistan also presented a review of implementation of the NBSAP, including some achievements and challenges encountered. He highlighted the need for institutional strengthening and involvement of private sectors in the implementation of a NBSAP. He said that Pakistan is considering revising its NBSAP, with consideration given to issues such as ABS, biosafety and REDD +.

30. Mr. David Duthie made a presentation on a review of NBSAPs undertaken by UNU-IAS. He first introduced the objective and methods of the study and then obstacles to implementation of NBSAPs. Some of the main findings from the review were:

(a) Women and indigenous communities are largely missing in the participation on NBSAP formulation.

(b) The coverage of the Convention on Biological Diversity objectives is uneven.

(c) Newer NBSAPs are approved at a Parliament level.

(d) CEPA is mentioned in NBSAPs as an add-on chapter but not integrated.

(e) Not all NBSAPs place biodiversity in a broader development policy context, some NBSAPs may have strong emphasis on development, but Millennium Development Goal (MDG) plans have no focus on biodiversity.

(f) Most NBSAPs highlight the need to valuate and create economic incentives for biodiversity, but few move beyond general statements.

(g) Mainstreaming with climate change and other biodiversity-related conventions is rather weak, although there are some positive signs emerging with recent national adaptation plans of action (NAPAs).

(h) Only very few countries in very new NBSAPs include time-bound and measurable targets.

(i) Generally there are very few NBSAPs with mechanisms for monitoring and review at the country level.

(j) Some countries have reported full implementation of 1st generation NBSAPs, but gaps and constraints to implementation are reported in nearly all other countries.

31. Then countries undertook group exercises on review of implementation of their NBSAPs, particularly achievements, challenges and possible solutions. The following table summarized results of the group discussions.

NBSAP Achievements:	**Challenges in implementing NBSAP:**
• Protected areas have increased • Status and baselines of biodiversity identified through biodiversity assessments • NBSAP prepared and in place • Institutional, policy and legal frameworks established • NBSAP translated into legal document • Enhancing capacity development into local and national plans • Establishing the context and creating high-level reference for national and subnational targets • NBSAP helped in mainstreaming biodiversity into other sectors and emphasize biodiversity for development • Provincial National Action Plans developed • Established partnerships in forestry • In-situ conservation improved • Legal and institutional framework established • Enhancing management of protected areas • Good will of government • Strong commitment from tech people • Biodiversity enshrined in constitution • Access to information improved • Process of preparation of NBSAP enables integration & mainstreaming of institutions & policies • Databases established • Reviews undertaken of existing relevant plans, policies and laws • Linkage with national socio-economic development plans • Thematic plans developed for forestry and other sectors	• Inadequate financial resources – Resource mobilization • Communicating the NBSAP (CEPA) • Lack of buy-in from, and participation of, key NBSAP stakeholders • Institutional fragmentation/devolution of tasks at federal/national/state governments • In some cases, the baseline information on biodiversity is unknown • Alignment with action plans, at a level where implementation is more attainable and direct • Lack of capacities • Ownership of NBSAP across the sectors is poor • Unclear identification of “actors” and “financial resources” • Lack of indicators for monitoring • Awareness-raising at leadership level (ministry, province, etc.) • Land management outside protected areas • Sustainable & responsible mining management • Communication between district leaders and community • Lack of coordination mechanisms • Conflict of mandates among stakeholders Lack of knowledge and awareness • Biodiversity not a priority issue • Non-inclusion of economic values of biodiversity • Unclear responsibilities and roles of stakeholders • Unstable political situation • Lack of technical experts in biodiversity particularly taxonomy • Inadequate international financial support • Lack of synergies among relevant Conventions

32. Ms. Sujata Arora from India made a presentation on what had been done so far in the development and implementation of India's Macro-level Action Strategy for Biodiversity, highlighting that it was a participatory process involving various sectors and stakeholders and resulted in more than 70 subnational level action plans. She said that India is considering revising part of its second NBSAP by including some national targets using the Aichi Biodiversity Targets as a framework. On challenges and opportunities for updating NBSAPs, she emphasized that revision of the NBSAP requires multi-sector coordination, and that biodiversity should be factored into poverty reduction and national economic growth. Mr. Indrani Chandrasekharan from India presented on progress in developing national targets.

33. Under the Green India Mission recently approved by the Indian Government, the following targets have been developed:

(a) To increase forest/tree cover on 5 million ha., and improved quality of forest cover on another 5 million ha.

(b) To increase forest-based livelihood incomes for 3 million forest-dependant families.

(c) To reach an annual CO_2 sequestration of 50 to 60 million tonnes by 2020, so as to increase share of GHG offset by India's forest and tree cover to 6% as compared to 4.5% that would have been offset in the absence of this Mission.

34. Ms. Chandrasekharan also stated that India had started national studies on the evaluation of biodiversity, an interim report of which will be expected by the eleventh meeting of the Conference of the Parties, and that India aimed to develop a framework for national green accounts by 2015. She also elaborated on the process of developing India's 12^{th} plan and the approaches by which environmental services and biodiversity will be integrated into the 12^{th} plan (one of them is to integrate payment for ecosystem services). She concluded by elaborating on issues for the conservation of biodiversity and issues and shared key targets for the 12^{th} plan period (2012-2017), including:

(a) To increase forest and tree cover by 5 percentage points.

(b) To prepare and implement recovery plans for identified 15 species.

(c) To relocate at least 48,000 families from tiger reserves.

(d) To introduce performance monitoring and development of environment performance linked mechanism for devolution of financial assistance to the States.

35. Mr. Zhang Fengchun from the China-Europe Biodiversity Programme presented on the updated NBSAP of China and experiences in mainstreaming biodiversity into sectoral and local planning processes. He stated that China's updated NBSAP (2011-2030) contains goals for 2015, 2020 and 2030, 8 strategic tasks, 10 priority areas, 30 priority actions, 35 priority areas for conservation and 39 priority projects for implementation. In elaborating on these, he stated that one of the goals set by China is that by 2020 China will strive to curb the loss of biodiversity. Among strategic tasks, China will mainstream biodiversity into various sectoral, cross-sectoral, national development and local planning processes, establish a system for access to genetic resources and benefit-sharing and take actions to address issues such as invasive alien species, GMOs and climate change.

36. Mr. Yuki Iwasa from Japan introduced the fourth updated NBSAP. He began by outlining the legal framework Japan has developed for biodiversity conservation, particularly the Basic Act on Biodiversity (enforced in June 2008). He stated that Japan's most updated NBSAP identified 2020 short-term targets and 2050 long-term targets to address four key issues, and the action plan contains 721 measures with 35 numerical indicators to achieve these targets. Four basic strategies identified include mainstreaming biodiversity in daily life, rebuilding sound relationships between man and nature in local communities, securing linkages between forests, countryside, rivers and the sea, and taking actions with global perspectives. He said that, by March 2011, 10 prefectures and 6 cities had completed their local biodiversity strategies and action plans, while 29 prefectures and several cities are developing local

BSAPs and all prefectures are expected to have their local BSAPs completed by the eleventh meeting of the Conference of the Parties.

37. Mr. Joseph d'Cruz (UNDP Regional Centre) and Ms. Haruko Okusu (UNEP ROAP) presented on how to access funds for updating NBSAPs and preparing the Convention on Biological Diversity fifth national report. Funds were available under the fifth replenishment of GEF under its fifth objective: "Integrate CBD Obligations into National Planning Processes through Enabling Activities". These funds were in a "focal area set-aside" separate from country specific allocations under the "STAR". Three ways to access these enabling funds were outlined by the GEF CEO: (i) through an agency (UNDP, UNEP, or other), in the regular way, (ii) direct access to funds from the GEF Secretariat (for countries with the necessary fiduciary mechanisms in place), and (iii) for LDCs and SIDs, an umbrella project under UNEP. For the latter, eligible countries were requested to send letters of endorsement to UNEP. UNDP also indicated that it would be possible to combine funds under the enabling activities with additional STAR funds. Templates for each of these modalities are available on the GEF website and also can be accessed via: http://www.cbd.int/nbsap/guidance-tools/finance/. Mr. d'Cruz introduced a guiding matrix prepared by the GEF in cooperation with the Secretariat of the Convention on Biological Diversity to assist countries with development of their project proposals. The matrix shows that in addition to the basic steps of preparing a strategy (with targets) and an action plan, components of projects can include preparatory studies, CHM-related activities, the development of a resource mobilization strategy, preparation of the fifth national report and other related activities. Following the presentation, there was some discussion on the amount of funds available. The GEF CEO had indicated that up to US$ 500,000 was available per country, yet some subsequent communications had indicated that the amount may be limited to US$ 200,000 under some modalities. Countries were advised to prepare well-justified proposals that reflect their actual needs and to submit them as soon as possible.

38. In preparation for the workshop, participants were requested to complete a questionnaire about their plans for updating and revising their NBSAPs and for mainstreaming biodiversity into broader policy frameworks. Further group discussions, as well as one-to-one discussions with staff of Convention on Biological Diversity, UNEP and UNDP, were held on this matter during the course of the workshop. The results of the questionnaire and subsequent discussions are summarized in annex II. Part 2.2 of this annex also lists potential elements for Aichi Biodiversity Target 2 resulting from exercises under agenda item IV.

39. Participants from some countries identified a number of possible targets or actions that relate to the Aichi Biodiversity Targets. These are provided in annex III.

ITEM 4. SETTING NATIONAL TARGETS IN THE FRAMEWORK OF THE AICHI BIODIVERSITY TARGETS

40. This agenda item was spread over four days, and also drew upon presentations and discussions under agenda items V and VI.

41. In introducing the SCBD training modules on NBSAPs and updating NBSAPs, Mr. David Cooper emphasized three important points below:

(a) **The NBSAP does not have to take the form of a single biodiversity-planning document**. Second generation, or revised NBSAPs resemble a planning process rather than a fixed document.

(b) The Convention requires countries not just to prepare an NBSAP, but to ensure that it contains elements that are incorporated into the planning and activities of all those sectors whose activities can have an impact (positive and negative) on biodiversity. This **mainstreaming** requires a multi-stakeholder process.

(c) The NBSAP should be **a living process** by which increasing knowledge, gained through monitoring and evaluation of each phase of implementation, is fed back.

42. He also presented results of the 2007 review, which were summarized in documents UNEP/CBD/WGRI/2/Add.1 and UNEP/CBD/COP/9/14/Rev.1. He highlighted good practices and examples from NBSAPs reviewed for target setting (Brazil), development of indicators (United Kingdom), stakeholder engagement (India), spatial planning (South Africa) and integrating biodiversity into national development planning (Indonesia). Then he introduced guiding principles for biodiversity planning based on decision IX/8:

(a) NBSAPs are key implementation tools of the Convention. They must address **all three objectives** of the Convention.

(b) The NBSAP should highlight, and seek to maintain the **contribution** of biodiversity and ecosystem services **to human well being**.

(c) The NBSAP is a **strategic** instrument for achieving concrete outcomes, and not a study.

(d) To be effective the NBSAP must be jointly developed, adopted, and owned by the full range of **stakeholders** involved. It is also important that **high-level government support** be secured.

(e) The NBSAP must include measures to **mainstream** biodiversity into sectoral and cross-sectoral policies and programmes.

(f) **Biodiversity planning is a long-term, cyclical and adaptive process**. It will involve continual monitoring, evaluation, and revision, as progress is made, conditions evolve, and lessons are learned.

43. David Cooper also presented an indicative outline of NBSAP which is contained in annex I. For the next steps for updating NBSAPs, he cited the mandate from decision X/2 of the Conference of the Parties and presented a proposed timeline until 2020, including the development of national targets, updating and implementing NBSAPs as well as monitoring and review of and reporting on implementation. He also outlined key steps for the biodiversity planning process and detailed key components for each cluster of activities in the process. He finally outlined the SCBD training module packages developed or being developed and planned regional or sub-regional workshops on updating NBSAPs for 2011 and 2012. In follow-up comments, Ms. Cristi Nozawa from Birdlife Asia emphasized that targets cannot be achieved by one nation alone, and they have to be jointly achieved by a group of countries at regional level. When asked whether ASEAN was considering setting regional targets, Ms. Arida from ASEAN Centre for Biodiversity indicated that the centre is now focused on helping ASEAN member states set national targets and develop indicators for monitoring before considering the targets at the regional level.

44. China introduced its post-2010 targets related to the Aichi Biodiversity Targets, which have been identified in the existing short-term, medium-term and long-term plans or strategies, particularly in the updated NBSAP and the 12th national five-year plan for social and economic development.

45. Mr. David Cooper recalled decision X/2 that requested Parties to develop national/regional targets in line with the framework of the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020, with a view to contributing to collective global efforts. He said that targets were needed to move from words to action, from action to measurable results. Targets help us do this by inspiring programmes for change, providing a focus for concerted action; measuring and reporting on progress in conservation and sustainable use at levels, establishing accountability in the conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity, and communicating status and trends of biodiversity to policy makers and the public. He cited national targets for the post-2010 period extracted from the fourth national reports, particularly Brazil's 2010 targets (some of which are still valid and relevant for the 2020 targets) and Australia's 2015 targets as an example. He emphasized that countries could adapt the global targets, and not necessarily develop national targets for every target. A set of national targets should cover the main biodiversity issues in the country, address the three objectives of the Convention on Biological Diversity, be specific and measurable, realistic, ambitious, be intricately linked to the NBSAP, relate to the Aichi Biodiversity Targets, be developed using a participatory process, be limited in number, at 5-10 targets, time-bound.

Goal A of the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020 and Aichi Biodiversity Targets 1 to 4.

46. Mr. David Cooper introduced targets under Goal A, particularly targets 2 & 3, emphasizing that national target setting should be related to national circumstances (national planning cycles, opportunities for integration and tools for integration such as SEA, regulations), and targets should be SMART (specific, measurable, ambitious, realistic and time-bound). Following that, countries were asked to work on possible national targets against target 2. Some targets developed by some participating countries are provided below in annex 2.1 and annex V.

Goal B of the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020 and Aichi Biodiversity Targets 5 to 10.

47. After an introduction of Goal B, participants were asked to identify major threats to key biodiversity components in their countries using the MA framework and then to choose one or more threats (particularly important ones) in your country and formulate a SMART target (for each threat) and identify actions and actors (stakeholders) needed. To help participants do this exercise, examples of post-2010 targets extracted from the fourth national reports were provided to each table. Countries reported on results of the exercise. For example, Bhutan identified habitat change in forest ecosystems as a key threat, and therefore proposed the following targets:

(a) Deforestation with the protected areas will be completely stopped by 2020.

(b) Deforestation outside the protected areas will be stopped or rate reduced by 50% by 2020.

48. Sri Lanka identified land use change as a key threat to biodiversity, therefore it proposed the following targets:

(a) By 2014 at least 30% of the land will be conserved.

(b) By 2014, deforestation will be reduced to 50% of the current rate.

Goal C of the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020 and Aichi Biodiversity Targets 11 to 13.

49. Mr. David Cooper introduced target 11 under Goal C (by 2020, at least 17% of terrestrial and inland water areas and 10% of coastal and marine areas), and provided a detailed annotation of this target (using a short guide to target 11). He emphasized that conservation should not be limited to strict nature reserves but can also be promoted in broader areas that are effective for conservation, including areas designated at various levels, and areas managed by indigenous and local communities. He emphasized that the target also requires areas to be effectively managed, ILCs depending on these areas should be involved, and that the system of protected areas should cover all the ecoregions. He noted that while many countries had surpassed the 10% target for terrestrial protected areas, overall, many eco-regions remained under-represented. Moreover few countries had established sufficient marine protected areas. Protected areas should be forming a system and contribute to management of the landscape at large.

50. Following the introduction of target 11, participants were asked to undertake individual country exercises on this target. Mr Cooper suggested that participants consider the following questions while setting national target 11:

(a) What is the current extent of protected areas on land and in marine areas, (i) overall, and (ii) by ecoregion? Do these figures include effective indigenous and community conserved areas?

(b) What areas of importance for biodiversity and ecosystem services are not currently protected? What areas are under-represented? Gap analysis –local, national and global perspectives.

(c) How effective are existing protected areas? How to improve.

(d) What are the opportunities and constraints to expanding protected areas, generally and by ecoregion?

(e) Who are the stakeholders, including indigenous and local communities, that may be affected? How can they be involved and their needs addressed? What are the trade-offs to consider?

(f) What additional resources (financial, human and technical) will be required to reach the national target that is set? How can additional funds be raised? What are possible funding sources?

51. The representative from Bhutan provided its exercise results which are contained in the following table. Representatives from Timor Leste and Malaysia raised questions on how to define protected areas. The representative from Birdlife commented on the perception by some policymakers of protected areas.

Bhutan	Current	By 2020
Current extent of protected areas on land (1) overall, and (2) by ecoregion.	51.4%	60%
Current extent of protected areas in marine areas, (1) overall, and (2) by ecoregion.	N/A	N/A
Areas of importance for biodiversity and ecosystem services that are not currently protected.	Wetlands outside the PAs	20% of the wetlands protected
Management effectiveness of existing protected areas.	81%	100%
Opportunities and constraints to expanding protected areas	No opportunities since all ecological representative are already covered	Scientific management in place
Stakeholders, including indigenous and local communities that may be affected.		
Additional resources (financial, human and technical) required to reach the national target that is set. How can additional funds be raised? What are possible funding sources?	Human and financial resources	
Other considerations		

Goal B of the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020 and Aichi Biodiversity Targets 5 to 10.

52. Mr. Sangmin Nam from NEASPEC Secretariat of United Nations Economic and Social Commission for Asia and the Pacific (UNESCAP) introduced the subregional programme for transboundary protected areas (over 100 protected areas along the international border) for flagship species and a few cases (Daurian International PA for white cranes, Khanka-Xingkai Lake International Nature Reserve and protected areas in the lower reaches of Tumen River). Despite the establishment of some transboundary protected areas, he stressed that domestic actions and international cooperation are still needed for protection of tigers and leopards. He highlighted that the North-East Asian Subregional Programme of Enviornmental Cooperation (NEASPEC) Nature Strategy aims to promote international cooperation and contribute to biodiversity conservation in northeast Asia.

53. Ms. Akane Minohara from the Secretariat of the International Partnership for the *Satoyama* Initiative (IPSI) of UNU-IAS introduced the *Satoyama* Initiative (SI), its International Partnership, relevant activities and their linkages with NBSAPs. She began by noting that there are many socio-ecological production landscapes in the world including Satoyama in Japan, as well as threats to such landscapes including abandoned land due to rural population decline, urbanization and exploitation. The SI was established to address these threats and help preserve benefits (climate mitigation, poverty alleviation, human well-being). She said that SI was established to improve knowledge and raise awareness, and to promote the maintenance and rebuilding of such landscapes. She quoted a relevant COP-10 decision related to SI (decision X/32) and parts of the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020 (vision and target 14 in particular) related to SI, and emphasized that the IPSI could help achieve the

vision and relevant targets of the Strategic Plan. While introducing a number of collaborative activities undertaken in different countries, she suggested that it is useful to take SI into consideration when updating NBSAP as it is addressing biodiversity and development issues, in line with the objectives of the Convention on Biological Diversity and promoting global and multi-sectoral partnerships. Cambodia commented on a national initiative linked to IPSI. In response to the question on funding from the IPSI, it was clarified that the IPSI is not a financial mechanism as such, but a platform to enhance synergies and maximize resources by matching organizations which were seeking for development needs on the one hand, and those looking for support on the other. In addition, the Secretariat of the Convention on Biological Diversity mentioned that part of the Japan Biodiversity Fund is to be used for the SI, and UNDP made a comment to encourage governments to apply for the GEF fund using the SI framework. Ms. Kaoru Ichikawa from UNU-IAS provided an explanation of the questionnaire survey on policies for supporting human-influenced natural environments, as part of activities conducted by UNU-IAS in relation to the SI.

54. Mr. David Cooper started by describing what ecosystem services are, quoting findings from the Millennium Ecosystem Assessment that 15 out of 24 ecosystem services are in decline. He then introduced Goal D (ecosystems that provide essential services are restored and safeguarded). Countries were asked to identify ecosystem services important for the country as a whole, and convert them into national targets (target 14), and to identify ecosystems/biodiversity that provide these services and which of these were under particular threat.

55. For target 16 under Goal D, Mr. David Duthie introduced the Nagoya Protocol on ABS, including details on the process of negotiation, key provisions and procedures therein. In response to a question on how many countries intended to sign the ABS Protocol, and how many countries had deposited instruments of ratification, Mr. Duthie answered that 13 countries had signed the protocol, but many more were expected to do so soon.[1]

Monitoring and Indicators

56. Considering that many participants stressed the importance of monitoring and use of indicators, Ms. Cristi Nozawa from Birdlife-Asia introduced their assessments using birds as indicators, and emphasized that much data was available for birds and Birdlife that help identify priorities for actions, track progress, build support and engage civil society. She specifically elaborated how work done by Birdlife and its partners at various levels could help track progress in implementing the 2020 targets, particularly targets 5, 7, 12 and 14, and how Birdlife could help countries monitor progress. One participant asked how to communicate data to governments. Another participant asked how to monitor local extinctions and migratory birds. One participant asked about development of trends in birds.

57. Mr. Philip Bubb from UNEP-WCMC introduced indicator development and using indicators to support target and strategy development and reporting. He first introduced national indicators used in national reports and NBSAPs. For example, South Africa used the protection status of vegetation types as an indicator for analysis to make a case for additional funding for the creation of Provincial Nature Reserves. He also stated that biodiversity indicators can be used to track progress in achieving targets, guide policy design and implementation, and build support. Successful indicators should be scientifically valid, based on available data, responsive to changes, easily understandable and relevant to user's needs. He shared some materials developed to assist countries in updating NBSAPs in line with the Aichi Biodiversity Targets. Finally he briefed participants on the next steps to be undertaken for indicator development building on the 2010 Biodiversity Indicators Partnerships. These included recommendations from the AHTEG on indicators, development of the global indicator suite to guide and propose options to support Parties in their development of indicators, monitoring, reporting and setting of targets. He also mentioned the potential contributions from the Intergovernmental Platform on Biodiversity and Ecosystem Services (IPBES). He concluded by saying that having an inspiring and clear target is more

[1] At the time of finalizing this report, there are 24 signatories. Up to date information is available at: http://www.cbd.int/abs/nagoya-protocol/signatories/.

important than the right indicators; there were data limitations, but a lot was possible with existing data; and therefore he suggested that countries have a national institution responsible for the gathering, analysis and communication of biodiversity information.

ITEM 5. INTEGRATING BIODIVERSITY INTO RELEVANT NATIONAL AND LOCAL PLANNING PROCESSES

58. Ms. Wang Yu from Rare Conservation introduced its approaches to social marketing for behaviour change to reduce illegal logging and to conserve forests and biodiversity. A case in Gaoligong Mountain Nature Reserve in Yunnan Province of China was provided. The first steps taken included the provision of fuel-efficient stoves and knowledge of why logging is a problem and how to use such stoves to solve the problem. Meanwhile Rare Conservation and its local partners used various means of communication to make such stoves desirable, including TV and radio shows, posters, celebrity endorsements, organizing festivals, and publishing brochures and children's books. As a result, attitudes of local communities towards local biodiversity and logging have changed significantly. For example, the percentage of villagers who consider the hoolock gibbon the most important local animal increased from 36% in 2008 to 94% in 2010. The percentage of villagers who know that their logging threatens the gibbon's survival increased from 53% in 2008 to 96% in 2010.

59. Mr. Zhang Fengchun introduced China's experiences in mainstreaming biodiversity obtained through implementation of the China-EU Biodiversity Programme. He said that the EU-China Biodiversity Programme had been working on three main areas, namely policy and institutional strengthening, visibility and awareness and field projects. This programme had been promoting mainstreaming of biodiversity through helping provincial, municipal and local governments develop local biodiversity strategies and action plans; integrating biodiversity as a factor to evaluate performance of government officials, including biodiversity in environmental/strategic environmental assessments; helping local governments establish biodiversity offices and interdepartmental coordination committees; mainstreaming biodiversity into land use planning; incorporating biodiversity issues into local policies and regulations; and integrating biodiversity into the 12th national and local five-year plans for social and economic development.

60. Mr. Song Jinfa from Chifeng, Inner Mongolia presented a case in linking biodiversity conservation with poverty reduction. To address grassland ecosystem degradation caused by overgrazing, local governments relocated farmers from ecologically-vulnerable areas and provided them with housing, pension, employment opportunities and alternative livelihoods through training and provision of small loans. Local governments relieved pressures on grassland by putting seasonable bans on grazing, encouraging enclosed breeding, and free supply of grass. Poor families or communities were also provided support such as building roads or bridges, provision of fertilizers and food and donation. Measures were also taken to address broader impacts on grassland ecosystems, such as regulating mining activities and eco-tourism.

61. Indonesia introduced its concept of and initiatives on strategic environmental assessments. Indonesia's Law No.32/2009 on Environmental Management defined "SEA" as a systematic, participative and an integrated process for evaluating the environmental impact and ensuring the integration of sustainable development principles into development planning as well as policies and programmes. The strategic environmental assessments undertaken in Indonesia currently cover assessments of environmental carrying capacities, negative impacts and risks on environment, environmental services, efficiency of use of natural resources, vulnerability of areas or the environment and biodiversity richness and vulnerability. Some initiatives undertaken in this regard from 2007 to 2010 included assessments for Sumatera Island Spatial Planning based on the ecosystem approach, mid-term local development planning for West Sumatra Province and Natural Resources Management Plan of Bali Province. In terms of lessons learned from the SEAs so far, political will and commitment from related institutions, both at national and local levels, are foundational to the process; intensive and cross-sectoral

data and information are required; stakeholder involvement and participation is crucial and the capacity of human resources to facilitate the process is important.

62. Ms. Somaly Chan from Cambodia introduced how biodiversity was mainstreamed into various policies, sectors, sectoral plans, programmes and actions. She informed that biodiversity issues had been incorporated into Cambodia's strategy for poverty reduction and national development plan. Cambodia also adopted a programmatic approach to natural resources management by adopting a framework for biodiversity and protected areas in 2011. In terms of sectoral integration, biodiversity has been mainstreamed into almost all relevant sectors, including land use planning and climate change mitigation. She also provided a long list of sectoral plans where biodiversity issues have been considered or incorporated, as well as some programmes and actions primarily for biodiversity conservation such as the Mekong Wetlands Biodiversity Conservation and Sustainable Use Programme (MWBP).

63. Mr. Nheden Amiel Sarne from the Philippines introduced national experiences in mainstreaming, with additional information provided by the UNDP Regional Centre based on projects carried out in the Philippines. He underlined the political commitment to integrating biodiversity into planning processes with planning guidelines issued and procedures put in place for review and approval. He highlighted that wide consultations had been undertaken for developing the Philippines Development Plan (2011-2016), cited vision, goals and measures in relevant chapters in the Plan that aim at environmental improvement, enhancing resilience of ecosystems, and improving conservation of natural resources. He particularly underlined biodiversity goals included in the Plan, such as preparing protected areas management plans, conserving wildlife and their habitats, and institutionalizing and operationalizing payment for ecosystem services. On lessons learned in this process, he emphasized the importance of stakeholder involvement.

64. A panel of participants from planning commissions or ministries (from Nepal, India, Maldives, Indonesia, Philippines and Thailand, facilitated by UNDP) was established to discuss how to translate global goals into development goals and budgets. It was highlighted that, as a biodiversity planner, you needed to "find your place" (i.e., identify an issue where you can integrate biodiversity into the agreed national agenda) for example, linking biodiversity with poverty alleviation. Collection of levies from tourists and hotels can be used for biodiversity conservation. Brunei collected fees for logging and used it for biodiversity conservation. Different methods were used to engage different stakeholders.

65. The participants of China's national workshop on the development of local biodiversity strategies and action plans joined the morning session on 13 May, at which time the Secretariat of the Convention on Biological Diversity introduced a module on the development of local biodiversity strategies and action plans. Mr. David Cooper recalled that the tenth meeting of the Conference of the Parties had endorsed the Plan of Action on Subnational Governments, Cities and other Local Authorities for Biodiversity which includes some activities recommended for subnational governments. He explained that local actions are crucial for implementing international and national policies as they are closest to biodiversity and have direct impacts on biodiversity. He noted that the population in cities accounts for close to 50% of the total population and uses 75% of natural resources. Their consumption and ecological footprints have wider impacts on ecosystems outside cities. He suggested some tools to address biodiversity challenges faced by cities and subnational governments, such as tools for land-use planning through mapping strategic environmental assessments. He also said that local BSAPs can be developed at various scales (province, city, local, eco-region), citing examples of policies or laws of some countries that require subnational governments to develop local BSAPs, such as Japan's Basic Act on Biodiversity which obliges all prefectures to develop BSAPs.

66. In the plenary discussions, the representative from Myanmar questioned the role of religious leaders in promoting biodiversity which was supported by Nepal who gave examples of religious and local government leaders combining forces to support local community sustainable forest management. The representative from Maldives commented on the challenge to achieve sustainable local management for biodiversity in so many (190) small islands and that EIA/SEA could help in this regard. The representative from Sri Lanka described the process of preparing subnational action plans and the

challenge of managing ecosystem types that occur in more than one local government administration. The representative from Indonesia also updated the meeting on their progress in developing local BSAPs. The representative from China stressed limitations related to knowledge on the status of local biodiversity and questioned how to link local aspirations to national aspirations with limited resources, however felt that establishing a clear linkage could assist with obtaining state-level financial support. Philippines also provided remarks on the importance of local level planning. Singapore explained that the Plan of Action included the Singapore Index on Cities' Biodiversity which was a monitoring tool for cities and local authorities to benchmark and monitor their biodiversity conservation efforts. The results of cities and local authorities' application of the Singapore Index could be fed into the national implementation and reporting to the Convention on Biological Diversity.

ITEM 6. STAKEHOLDER ENGAGEMENT AND STRATEGIC COMMUNICATION

67. Mr. Ronny Mustamu, a member of IUCN Commission on Education and Communication (CEC), asked participants at each table to indicate their expectations of the presentation. Most answers related to how to communicate better and more effectively with other stakeholders, from the aspect of improving their own communication skills as well as from the aspect of engaging stakeholders.

68. The presenter invited participants to do an exercise on stakeholder communication assessment. On a map of eight stakeholders, participants were asked to assess their communication relations with each. Many stakeholders were identified. It was recognized that communication styles should be more diversified. Participants felt that communication with political leaders was the most challenging.

69. The short film "Love, Not Loss" was presented. Comments made by participants concerning communication challenges related to how communication can result in effective action (i.e., what is right message to communicate?). The message of biodiversity loss (i.e., based on threat of extinction) has been communicated for many years however has not led to halting biodiversity loss. Consequently, the presenters suggested the use of more positive "love" messages and less use of "loss" messages.

ITEM 7. RESOURCE MOBILIZATION FOR NBSAP IMPLEMENTATION

70. Mr. David Cooper and Mr. Joseph D'Cruz introduced the module on resource mobilization, recalling Aichi Target 20 of the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020 and the Strategy for Resource Mobilization in which countries are encouraged to design and implement a country-specific resource mobilization strategy in the framework of updated NBSAPs. He shared estimates on the current and future scale of biodiversity financing from various sources, noting that estimates vary significantly among different publications issued in different years. Funding might be considered at different levels such as through enabling activities; core biodiversity activities; activities in other sectors that contribute to the mainstreaming biodiversity; ecosystem-based management that more generally includes activities that contribute to climate change adaption and mitigation; and broad activities that reduce the underlying causes of biodiversity loss that are part of a sustainable (or "green") economy. Country-specific resource mobilization strategies should move beyond a "shopping list" of projects to fund and aim to promote the mobilization of additional resources for biodiversity, including through new mechanisms and reallocation of funds, as well as the efficient use of all funds (including existing resources). He proposed that country-specific resource mobilization strategies might contain the following elements:

(a) Economic rationale for investment in biodiversity

(b) Analysis of existing mechanisms for the generation and delivery of funds at the national level (including national budget)

(c) Assessment of funding needs for implementation of the NBSAP (achievement of the national and Aichi Targets). This may include:

(i) identification of precise needs for core biodiversity activities and in the shorter short term)

(ii) a more general assessment of broader activities and in the longer term

(d) Proposals for Policy and institutional change, e.g. establishment of new funds.

71. Following this introduction, participants were asked to work in groups and to identify current and potential funding under the "levels" referred to in the previous paragraph, identify actions required to mobilize additional resources and, if possible, to elaborate elements of potential national targets for their country or group. Some of the results of these exercises and subsequent discussions are compiled in annex IV.

72. UNDP/UNEP emphasised that the relatively small funds directly available to those involved in biodiversity planning should be used to leverage additional funds for biodiversity, including through mainstreaming. For example, countries could use funds from GEF for some activities, attract more funds and make a case for budgeting. In the subsequent discussion, India indicated that money spent in forestry constituted 1.8% of the state budget, 0.4% of funds out of the national and state budgets spent on pollution abatement. She recommended using national currency rather than USD figures and the need to put these amounts in context. She also highlighted that ownership of NBSAP is important for mobilizing funds.

ITEM 8. STRENGTHENING SCIENTIFIC AND TECHNICAL COOPERATION IN THE REGION

73. Mr. Soe of the National Institute of Biological Resources (NIBR) of Korea presented the technical capacity and cooperation activities of NIBR – in collaboration with a wide range of partners, countries in the region – on biological resources, data and specimen analysis. In support of the Convention on Biological Diversity Initiative on South-South Cooperation on Biodiversity for Development, the NIBR is involved, through an MoU, in organizing workshops and other training activities in the region.

74. Ms. Clarissa Arid from the ASEAN Centre for Biodiversity (ACB) made a presentation on the use of national and regional CHMs as a tool for scientific and technical cooperation. She provided suggestions for content of national CHM and shared content of regional CHM developed for ASEAN. She briefed participants on a few collaborative activities with some partners using CHM. Ms. Monina Uriarte from the ASEAN Centre for Biodiversity introduced activities for scientific and technical cooperation among ASEAN member states in various fields such as wildlife enforcement, information sharing, management of protected areas, taxonomic initiatives and ABS.

75. Ms. Zhang Rui from Secretariat of the Convention on Biological Diversity provided an overview of South-South Cooperation on Biodiversity and the draft Convention on Biodiversity Multi-Year Plan of Action for South-South Cooperation, highlighting opportunities for developing countries to enhance implementation capacity of the NBSAP through technical and scientific cooperation in line with Article 18 of the Convention.

76. David Duthie complemented the discussion by sharing a recent study undertaken by the Royal Society concerning South-South Cooperation, noting that it presented the pattern of network of centres in the "north" and "south", and the trend of the "emerging south" in the academic field of biodiversity.

77. The following points emerged from the presentation and discussion:

(a) Strengthened technical and scientific cooperation among Parties, including South-South Cooperation is essential for the full implementation of the Convention and the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020 and achievement for the Aichi Biodiversity Targets (see article 18 of the Convention). The Clearing-House Mechanism has a major role to play in this regard.

(b) The regional workshop is itself a significant example of technical and scientific cooperation among Parties and partners with a large South-South component. It has brought together 21 countries of the region as well as partner organizations to share expertise and experience. These have

included: international and regional organizations: ASEAN Centre for Biodiversity (ACB), UNU, regional office of UNDP, UNEP, UNESCAP, UNEP-WCMC; Birdlife International; and national organizations; Chinese Academy for Environmental Planning and the Korean National Institute for biological Resources.

(c) The increasing role of developing countries in supporting scientific and technical cooperation was noted. India emphasized this point with an example of India-South Africa-Brazil cooperation.

(d) Countries indicated particular expertise in the following biodiversity-related fields that could be offered to other partners in the region: traditional knowledge, landscape management (Sri-Lanka); marine, coastal management, protected area management, forest management (Philippines, Indonesia); climate change information, vulnerability of pacific island states (Maldives); ecosystem-based adaptation, bird, wildlife and habitat (Bangladesh, Pakistan); taxonomy and conservation (Mongolia, Korea); urban biodiversity and index (Singapore); Survey (Viet Nam); principle of conservation (Bhutan).

(e) Additional relevant organizations in the region identified by participants include: University of the Philippines Institutes of Biodiversity, Marine Science and college of forestry; SEARCA, ECO; SAARC; PMNH; PFI; Wildlife Conservation Society of the Philippines, Philippines nature plant conservation society" and marine science networks in the Philippines); Sri-Lanka's Botanic Garden and zoological garden exchange programmes and Bangladesh's National Technical Committee on biodiversity.

(f) While some countries indicated that they do not have national institutions that have strong technical expertise, they agreed that efforts should be made to identify other "centres of excellence" that could contribute to a network for strengthened technical and scientific cooperation among Parties, including South-South Cooperation, that could support all partners.

(g) It was noted that much relevant information is available in the fourth national reports.

(h) Many participants raised the needs of data capacity, biodiversity status, baseline, monitoring and evaluation tools, detailed information on ecosystem health, value and species and their vulnerability, trend, funding, etc.

(i) Many organizations (e.g., UNESCAP, UNEP-WCMC, ASEAN) are exploring how South-South Cooperation can support their specialized programmes: transboundary management (UNESCAP), knowledge exchange (CHM, ASEAN), and data, indicator and other technical areas (WCMC) for new training models with a SSC add-on (WCMC).

ITEM 9. SYNTHESIS AND CONCLUSIONS OF THE FIRST PART OF THE WORKSHOP

78. In conclusion, the first part of the workshop participants highlighted a number of points, addressed in the following paragraphs.

79. Countries need to initiate, as early as possible, the process of revising or updating NBSAPs in line with the framework of the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020 in order to maintain the momentum established at the tenth meeting of the Conference of the Parties and enable countries to take the actions needed to achieve the Aichi Biodiversity Targets. In this regard, the countries represented at the workshop set out their plans (see annex II).

80. With regard to the process of updating NBSAPs:

(a) Countries could start with development of national targets in line with the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020 and report targets to the eleventh meeting of the Conference of the Parties in 2012. The Strategic Plan should be well examined in order to develop appropriate national targets.

(b) All relevant stakeholders including policy makers and local communities should be engaged and involved in the process, including through national consultations and workshops.

(c) Current NBSAPs and their implementation should be carefully reviewed to identify gaps and issues that need to be addressed in updated NBSAPs, using the fourth national report as a reference.

(d) Countries should examine planning processes for the national development plans, poverty reduction strategies, etc., to identify opportunities to integrate biodiversity targets and objectives. Eligible countries should move quickly to access funds from the Global Environment Facility and other sources to update their NBSAPs.

81. Countries emphasized that the resources for supporting enabling activities under GEF-5 needed to be made available promptly according to clear and uncomplicated procedures. Many countries indicated that resources up to US$500,000 per country would be needed in line with the information provided by the GEF CEO. Countries were urged to submit applications for GEF funds as soon as possible.

82. A tentative outline for updated NBSAPs is provided in annex I, noting that it will need to be adapted to the specific needs of each country. With regards to the content of NBSAPs, it was noted that updated NBSAPs should:

(a) address threats to biodiversity and causes of biodiversity loss;

(b) take into account values of biodiversity and ecosystem services, making a case for all relevant sectors and actors to take action;

(c) include legal and policy frameworks including incentive measures that need to be developed to support its implementation;

(d) have a long-term vision, guiding principles, strategic goals and national targets (including milestones if necessary) as well as priority actions to achieve these targets;

(e) identify priority actions to address key threats and biodiversity issues in the country, and actions taken by subnational governments and other local authorities should be identified in support of implementation of NBSAPs; and

(f) include a monitoring and reporting system, with indicators, to track implementation of the NBSAP and allow adjustments to be made when necessary.

83. Given decision X/2, the establishment of national targets is particularly important for the generation of the NBSAPs. Targets should be specific, measurable, ambitious, realistic and time-bound (SMART). Countries do not necessarily develop or include all the 20 targets of the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020, and target setting should also take into account national circumstances, addressing key biodiversity issues and threats that require short-term, mid-term and long-term actions at various levels.

84. Updated NBSAPs should identify ways and means to integrate biodiversity into relevant national and local planning processes, such as landscape planning, strategic environment assessments, linking biodiversity with poverty alleviation and sustainable development.

85. Decentralization polices underway in many countries offer both challenges and opportunities to integrate biodiversity into local planning processes. Subnational and local biodiversity strategies and action plans may be useful tools in this regard, and support to subnational governments and other local authorities may be provided for this purpose.

86. Moving beyond a “shopping list” of projects to fund, country-specific resource mobilization strategies should aim to promote the mobilization of additional resources for biodiversity, including through new mechanisms and reallocation of funds, as well as the efficient use of all funds (including existing resources). They could include the following elements:

(a) The economic rationale for investment in biodiversity;

(b) An analysis of existing mechanisms for the generation and delivery of funds at the national level (including national budget);

(c) An assessment of funding needs for implementation of the NBSAP (achievement of the national and Aichi Targets), both for shorter term activities and a more general assessment of broader activities and in the longer term;

(d) Proposals for policy and institutional change, for example, establishment of new funds.

87. The regional workshop is itself a significant example of technical and scientific cooperation among Parties and partners with a large South-South component. It has brought together 22 countries of the region as well as partner organizations to share expertise and experience. Such strengthened technical and scientific cooperation among Parties, including South-South Cooperation is essential for the full implementation of the Convention and the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020 and achievement for the Aichi Biodiversity Targets (see article 18 of the Convention). The Clearing-House Mechanism has a major role to play in this regard.

ITEM 10. SPECIAL FOCUS ON VALUATION AND INCENTIVE MEASURES

88. Mr. Markus Lehmann from the Secretariat of the Convention on Biological Diversity introduced the item by referring to the decision of the tenth meeting of the Conference of the Parties requesting the provision of support to countries in making use of the findings of the TEEB study and in integrating the values of biodiversity into relevant national and local policies, programmes and planning processes. He also recalled the programme of work on incentive measures of the Convention and its focus on facilitating the exchange among practitioners of practical experiences in the design and implementation of incentive measures, with a view to building or enhancing capacities and promoting common understanding. He introduced Ms. Haripriya Gundimeda from the Indian Institute of Technology Bombay and one of the coordinators of the TEEB study for local and regional policymakers, to introduce the main findings of the initiative on the Economics of Ecosystems and Biodiversity (TEEB).

89. Ms. Gundimeda recalled the classification of ecosystem services developed under the Millennium Ecosystem Assessment and the various contributions these ecosystem services make to human well-being. The “GDP of the poor” concept would highlight the particular role of ecosystem services for the well-being of the poor. The continued degradation of ecosystems and biodiversity would lead to lost development opportunities and eventually to a vicious circle of further poverty-induced overuse and degradation. For instance, a study on tribal settlements adjacent to Nagarhole National Park (India) found that they relied on non-timber forest products (e.g., wild food, gum, fibres, and medicinal plants) for an average of 28% of their total household income, reaching almost 50% in some areas.

90. Against this background, the various reports of the initiative on the Economics of Ecosystems and Biodiversity (TEEB) would demonstrate the value of ecosystem services and biodiversity to the economy as well as to society and individuals, show how these can be taken into account in decision-making, and identify and support policy solutions, geared both towards the development of new tools as well as to the promotion of the wider application of existing tools that have proven to be successful. She provided a brief overview to TEEB’s approach to economic valuation, and discussed a number of good practice cases in the successful application of valuation and policy tools. A number of the cases presented originated from the region.

(a) A comprehensive assessment of the ecosystem services provided by the traditional rice production system in Kala Oya river basin management (Sri Lanka) revealed that the share of rice in total economic benefits of almost 3.000US$ (ha/year) was less than 200US$, the balance resulting from a range of other ecosystem services such as the provision of fish, fodder, lotus flowers, and above all, drinking water. In consequence, and in contradiction to received wisdom, restoring and maintaining the traditional production system with diversified benefits appeared as a sound sustainable development strategy.

(b) Payment for ecosystem services and certification schemes introduced in Satoyama Landscapes in Japan led to a considerable reduction in pesticides and to the re-introduction of the White Stork, as species which was declared extinct in the 1970s.

(c) A study on the economic value of mangrove forests in Southern Thailand, focusing on the policy option of converting these into shrimp farms, revealed that shrimp farming is no longer profitable once the economic values of mangrove forests for offshore fisheries and as coastline protection are taken into account.

(d) The Biorights Programme in East Kolkatta, India, compensated poor people dependent on the East Kolkata Wetlands for cash generating activities for behavioral changes. The wetlands, a threatened Ramsar site in Eastern India, were used as a sewage dumping ground by local stakeholders with no awareness about their ecological importance.

(e) Valuation studies undertaken in Sri Lanka revealed that Colombo city residents' willingness to pay for the conservation of elephants exceeds the funding needed for compensating rural elephant damage, mainly incurred through crop raiding. In consequence, a small charge addition to the premium payments of life/vehicle policy holders was suggested as an innovative financing option.

(f) Under the ecoBUDGET approach in Tubigon, Philippines, the coordinated conservation of ecosystems is achieved through an environmental management system where the common budgeting and accounting system is used as a framework for setting up an environmental budget, in which key natural resources are selected, and targets set and measured on a recurrent basis. This led to strengthened cross-sector involvement while the annual budget cycle ensures continuous follow-up.

(g) Under the new spatial planning law in Indonesia, relevant ecosystem services as well as their spatial connections were identified and assessed using the InVEST (Integrated Valuation of Ecosystems Services and Tradeoffs) tool. Policy options were appraised under different scenarios, and specific recommendation were developed for land-use planning; namely, where to restore habitats, where to allocate forest concessions, and for which areas to apply for forest carbon PES.

91. In the subsequent discussion, participants pointed to the difficulty in assigning quantitative values for some aspects of biodiversity, for instance, endemism. Reacting to Ms. Gundimeda's observation that the poor's well-being frequently depend on ecosystem services, participants noted that they may include various stakeholder groups with different economic endowments and activities and, accordingly, different policy needs.

92. Referring to the case presented on the valuation of mangrove forests in Southern Thailand, participants observed that decision-making is frequently cast into overly simplistic "conservation versus development" scenarios, suggesting a need for hard policy tradeoffs. A comprehensive identification and analysis of all policy options and their opportunity costs at landscape level may yield management solutions that are able to accommodate both development and conservation needs. For instance, smart land use, spatial planning and zoning could prohibit shrimp farming in certain high-value mangrove forests while allowing it in other areas, with close monitoring and regulation in accordance with the resilience of the ecosystem.

Valuation

93. Mr. Andrew Seidl, Head of the IUCN Global Economics and the Environment Programme, and Mr. Markus Lehmann, Economist of the Secretariat of the Convention on Biological Diversity, presented on the valuation of biodiversity and associated ecosystems, focusing on Aichi Target 2 of the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020. They reviewed key conceptual issues and approaches to valuation, with an emphasis on economic valuation, and discussed the role of valuation in providing a means to inform resource management choices when market prices fail to reflect social values. They introduced the general approach of Total Economic Value (TEV) and provided an overview of different valuation tools as well as their strengths and limitations. Using the case presented earlier on the valuation of mangrove

forests in southern Thailand, they explained how different tools might be used together in order to better understand the values of different ecosystem services.

94. Based on existing National Biodiversity Strategy and Actions Plans as well as the third and fourth national reports, they reviewed existing achievements on valuation in the region, including valuation studies at national and regional levels, such as the valuation of coastal ecosystem services undertaken by the UNEP GEF project on reversing environmental degradation trends in the South China Sea and Gulf of Thailand (http://www.unepscs.org/). They also noted that several countries in the region already undertook efforts to strengthen environmental accounting, with India and the Philippines being among the first round of participating pilot countries in the Wealth Accounting and Valuation of Ecosystem Services (WAVES) partnership.

95. They subsequently presented, based on TEEB work, a step-by-step, pragmatic approach to valuation that would be informed by the peculiarities of the case and the particular needs and priorities of the individual country.

96. The need to embed valuation exercises in comprehensive analyses and planning at landscape level, identified during the discussion on the introductory presentation of Ms. Gundimeda, became a recurrent topic in the group's discussions. In this context, it was also noted that spatial planning, and valuation approaches within it, was difficult whenever political boundaries do not match ecological boundaries. Moreover, the opportunity costs of the different options would also depend on prior decisions regarding land use planning. The resulting scale and path dependency would sometimes make the calculation of opportunity costs difficult.

97. Participants also stressed the political economy of decision-making. In consequence, short term benefits would often trump long term benefits, even if the latter are higher. In order to counter this tendency, valuation needs to be undertaken early in the policy cycle, so that proposals could be submitted with a full assessment of their economic costs and benefits.

98. Mr. Zheng Hua, from the Chinese Academy of Sciences, presented a study on the application of the InVEST tool in Hainan Island, China. InVEST (Integrated Valuation of Ecosystems Services and Tradeoffs) was developed by the Nature Capital Project at Stanford University (http://www.naturalcapitalproject.org/InVEST.html) and provides a spatially explicit platform for mapping the stocks and flows of ecosystem services. In some cases, it also provided guidance as to the relative ecosystem service values of different development scenarios. InVEST can provide useful information for addressing some of the challenges associated with implementing Aichi Target 2 in scaling up economic ecosystem service values and in optimizing investment and use over time and space.

99. In Hainan Island, a tropical island in the south of China, challenges in protecting ecosystem services result from a dynamic expansion of rubber tree cultivation and a subsequent reduction in natural forest areas. Key regulating services, in particular hydrological services, are increasingly threatened. The InVEST model was used to assess the impacts of land use and land cover change on important ecosystem services and how these are distributed across the landscape, with a view to improve the sustainability of land use management decisions and the coordination of regional development and ecosystem services conservation. In addition to rubber production, ecosystem services captured by the model include: water purification, sedimentation retention, storm peak mitigation, and carbon sequestration.

100. Echoing their earlier discussion on the importance of valuation at landscape level, participants recognized the usefulness of the InVEST tool and underlined the need to learn from the experiences made in its application in various countries. In land use planning, the model could inform the optimal location of different land use options with a view to maximise benefits arising from the mix of ecosystem services.

101. Ms. Yu Fang from the Chinese Academy of Environmental Planning presented China's Integrated System of Environmental and Economic Accounting (CSEEA). She explained that the system distinguishes resource damage costs (with regard to mineral resources as well as arable land, forestry, water, and fisheries resources) and environmental degradation costs (water, air, and solid waste pollution

as well as ecological deterioration). Monetary accounting of these costs is typically based on imputed abatement costs or environmental deterioration costs. A green GDP could be calculated by subtracting these costs from the traditional GDP.

102. She explained that designing a set of indicators for evaluation of resource productivity or use efficiency, including their social and environmental cost, could guide industry in its efforts to improve environmental management. Further work would include strengthening biodiversity accounting, including the more systematic accounting of wildlife habitats and the development of quantitative or semi-quantitative evaluation methods for biodiversity.

103. Participants noted and discussed a number of methodological issues surrounding environmental accounting:

(a) Some implications of environmental degradation are already reflected in conventional national accounts and measures of economic well-being, for instance, the loss of agricultural production resulting from pollution or soil degradation. This needs to be taken into consideration in order to avoid double-counting.

(b) How to implement green accounting framework in countries with economic activities that are largely driven by small and medium enterprises.

(c) How to reflect the role of marine ecosystems in green accounting.

104. Participants subsequently worked in break-out groups. Based on the presentations and a one-page fact sheet, participants were requested to reflect on how to translate Aichi Target 2 into national action, by developing mock national targets, milestones, and activities for inclusion into a revised NBSAP. A synthesis of this work is provided in annex V.

Incentive measures

Incentives that are harmful for biodiversity

105. Mr. Lehmann made a presentation on addressing incentives that are harmful to biodiversity, focusing on Aichi Target 3. He explained that harmful incentives can result from environmentally harmful subsidies; from laws and regulations governing resource use; and from the non-internalization of externalities, and provided specific examples for each of these categories. Based on the TEEB studies as well as earlier work under the Convention as reflected in CBD Technical Series 56, he presented key lessons learned in identifying and removing, phasing out, or reforming incentives that are harmful for biodiversity. Based on existing National Biodiversity Strategy and Actions Plans as well as the third and Fourth National Reports, he also reviewed achievements in the region on the identification and reform or phasing out of such incentives.

106. He drew particular attention to the potential synergies in policy reforms, noting that some policy actions, such as the removal or phasing out of environmentally harmful subsidies, can also free scarce public funds for alternative purposes, possibly including the funding of positive incentive measures for the conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity.

107. Discussion on this item revolved around conceptual clarifications regarding the difference between incentives and incentive measures as well as the presented types of measures which generate harmful incentives. Participants also emphasized the importance of one of the lessons learned that was presented, namely, the importance of taking an all-of-government-approach to removing, phasing out, or reforming harmful incentives. They underlined that achieving this may frequently be challenging.

108. A subsequent interactive exercise tasked participants to identify, in country groups, programmes or policies that they thought would both generate harmful incentives for biodiversity and be ineffective against their stated objectives, as interesting candidates for prioritized policy action.

Positive incentive measures

109. Ms. Nathalie Olsen, from IUCN Global Economics and the Environment Programme, presented the development and application of positive incentive measures, again with a focus on Aichi Target 3. The presentation included lessons learned on how to encourage biodiversity-friendly outcomes and businesses through certification and labelling, possibly within community-based natural resource management, the scope for introducing markets for ecosystem services, and the application of payment for ecosystem services schemes. She also presented a number of case examples of successful schemes.

110. As concrete examples from the region, she referred to the Himalayan Biotrade initiative, which was created by the Asia Network for Sustainable Agriculture and Bioresources (ANSAB) in order to assist local community enterprises in Nepal to market their non-timber forest products (NTFPs) on national and international markets, and thereby encouraging community support for forest conservation. In the context of her discussion of global cases for successful application of PES schemes, she also pointed to China's Sloping Land Conversion Programme, under which participating farmers were paid to convert cultivated land on steeply sloping hillsides back to forest or grassland. Likewise, in the Sukhomajri watershed in India, sedimentation was prevented by convincing upstream land users to stop grazing on slopes. Additional dams were built to provide irrigation to compensate villagers for loss of revenue from reduced grazing.

111. In the subsequent discussion, participants noted: (i) the linkages between the provision of positive incentive measures and traditional conversation projects, as the latter are frequently more successful if they take the economic interests of local communities into consideration; (ii) that the implementation of disincentives (e.g., under fees) can alleviate the need to provide positive incentives while possibly also providing a source of funding for positive incentive measures; (iii) the role of incentive schemes in discouraging illegal settlement in protected areas or, as is done in Malaysia, the provision of relocation incentives; (iv) the importance of appropriate framework regulation in which incentive schemes would be embedded; (v) the ongoing importance of adequate capacity in monitoring and enforcement, as incentive schemes can alleviate but not replace monitoring and enforcement activities.

112. Mr. Kentaro Yoshida, professor at Nagasaki University, Japan, presented Japan's experiences in undertaking economic valuation and providing positive incentive measures. He provided an overview of the results of the valuation studies undertaken in order to guide the subsequent design of policy measures in various sectors, in particular in agriculture, forestry and fisheries.

113. He explained that the ecosystem services provided by some agricultural production systems, such as flood regulation, water supply and purification, maintenance of cultural landscape, were recognized since the early 1970s. Positive incentives were provided for sustainable agriculture based on valuation studies using replacement cost and contingent valuation. The replacement cost method has also been used to estimate forest-related ecosystem services, and valuation results have garnered various forest conservation measures, such as the establishment of conservation forests providing public benefits, such as securing water resource and preventing disasters, as well as direct payment programmes.

114. As a concrete case example, he presented on the management of Kabukuri-numa wetland, a Ramsar site as it is one of the most important wintering sites of migratory wild birds. Measures such as water management, clean-ups, channel maintenance and water quality improvement are regularly conducted in adjacent rice paddies by collective actions of farmers and NGOs, in cooperation with the local government. Both the central and the local governments give direct payments to compensate the loss of farmers' income and additional costs incurred by bird-friendly farming practices. In addition, farmers sell value-added organic rice which is also labelled as wildbird-friendly. Local ecotourism is also promoted.

115. In reacting to his presentation, participants addressed and discussed various methodological issues surrounding valuation and positive incentive measures, such as the necessary targeting of positive incentives so as to achieve cost-effectiveness, and the relative suitability of various valuation methods to

measure specific ecosystem services. They generally noted the useful role valuation studies can play in calibrating such positive incentive measures.

116. Participants subsequently worked in break-out groups. Based on the presentations and the earlier exercise on the session on harmful incentives, they were tasked to work on a number of lead questions that would assist in translating Aichi Target 3 into national targets, milestones, and possible activities. A synthesis this work is provided in annex V.

ITEM 11 CLOSING OF THE WORKSHOP

117. The closing session was chaired by Mr. Yue Ruisheng of the Ministry of Environmental Protection of China. He congratulated the sponsors, the organizers and participants on the success of the workshop, stating that he believed that it provided significant support to countries in the region to translate the Aichi Biodiversity Targets into national targets and actions. Meanwhile, he took note of three important things the workshop had achieved. First, the workshop had built ownership of the global biodiversity targets as well as capacities for actions at all levels as actions were needed to implement the slogan of "biodiversity is life", biodiversity is our life" for the International Year of Biodiversity, noting that the 2010 Biodiversity Target was not achieved. Actions should start by protecting biodiversity around us as we are beneficiaries of our own actions. He called on everyone to make the best efforts to protect biodiversity, be it individuals, organizations, local or national governments. Second, this workshop had built partnerships for action. Without partnerships, we were not able to accomplish these Aichi Biodiversity Targets. Finally this workshop had provided a very good platform or opportunity to foster friendships among participants, which were important for future collaboration.

118. On behalf of the Executive Secretary of the Convention on Biological Diversity, Mr. David Cooper gave some closing remarks, thanked the countries for their participation in the workshop and once again thanked China for hosting the workshop, particularly the Ministry of Environmental Protection of China, the Foreign Economic Cooperation Centre under MEP, the Environment Department of Shaanxi Province, the Chanba Ecological District of City of Xi'an, and the Executive Committee of the 2011 Xi'an International Horticultural Exposition. He said that it is time for countries to build on the momentum set in Nagoya and translate global targets into national targets and strategies. He agreed with Mr,Yue that we had a good start and we have heard good presentations and discussions on various topics including target setting, mainstreaming, and national accounting. He was pleased to note that provinces and cities from China also met this week to develop their local strategies and action plans. He also thanked partners namely, IUCN, UNEP, UNDP, ASEAN Centre for Biodiversity, NGOs and some Chinese, Japanese, Indian and Korean national institutions or centres of excellence, for their support of the workshop. Noting that this was one of a series of regional workshops on updating NBSAPs supported by Japan, he thanked the Government of Japan for its great support to make these workshops possible. He said that through this workshop all participants learned a lot from each other due to the commitment of each person, and that huge tasks were still ahead back home. He thanked participants for their commitments and enthusiasm.

119. Mr. Li Jingxi, on the behalf of the Environment Department of Shaanxi Province, said that the workshop had achieved the expected outcomes and he congratulated the organizers and participants on its success. He stated that the province had learned a lot from the workshop, particularly in regard to global developments in biodiversity conservation, experiences of Asian countries and commitments of all participants.

Annex I

INDICATIVE OUTLINE OF AN NBSAP

I. INTRODUCTION

A concise account of the necessary background, setting the scene for updated NBSAP and providing the rationale for the strategy and actions therein. Where necessary, may be complemented by in-depth studies annexed to the main NBSAP.

1. **Values of biodiversity and ecosystem services in the country and their contribution to human well-being -** Importance of biodiversity for the country. Highlight contribution to human well-being, socio-economic development, including poverty reduction. Include analysis of economic and other values.

2. **Causes and consequences of biodiversity loss -** Main threats to biodiversity (and ecosystems) and their underlying causes. Impacts of threats on biodiversity and ecosystems and socio-economic implications of the impacts. Describe the impacts of declining biodiversity and ecosystems on human well-being, livelihoods, poverty reduction, etc. Link the threats (direct drivers) with the underlying causes (indirect drivers) and relate these to the relevant economic sectors.

3. **Constitutional, legal and institutional framework -** Overview of the biodiversity policy and planning framework and relevant broader policy and planning processes (national development plans, poverty reduction strategies, climate change adaptation plans, etc.) Include an outline of any relevant constitutional, legal and institutional elements.

4. **Lessons learned from the earlier NBSAP(s) and the process of developing the updated NBSAP. -** A brief account of progress in implementing earlier NBSAPs (where relevant). Summary results of any evaluation of the effectiveness of earlier NBSAPs. What challenges and gaps need to be addressed, and main priority areas for a revised NBSAP. Might also develop scenarios of biodiversity futures. Might also include brief reflections on the process of developing the previous NBSAP and how it may have influenced its effectiveness. Briefly outline the process of updating the NBSAP including stakeholder consultations.

II. NATIONAL BIODIVERSITY STRATEGY: PRINCIPLES, PRIORITIES AND TARGETS

The main "high-level" elements of the Strategy that provides the framework for the NBSAP as a whole:

5. **Long term vision -** Outline the long-term vision for the state of biodiversity in the country. This should be an inspirational statement that reflects the importance of biodiversity for people and is broadly shared across the country. This may be for 2050 (as is the case for the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020) or may be aligned with other long term national development plans.

6. **Principles governing the strategy -** Core values and beliefs underlying the NBSAP.

7. **Main goals or priority areas -** The most pressing issues that are addressed by the NBSAP. Among these should be goals to ensure the mainstreaming of biodiversity (i.e., the integration of biodiversity into broader national policies, strategies and plans).

8. **National Targets (SMART) -** National biodiversity targets in line with the Aichi Biodiversity Targets. These should be strategic, specific, measurable, ambitious but realistic targets that are time-bound (usually for 2020). They may be grouped under the main goals or priority areas.

III. NATIONAL ACTION PLAN

The details of the Strategy and the Action Plan:

9. **National actions to achieve the strategy, with milestones --** The actions needed to achieve the targets. These should consist largely of strategic actions such as institutional, legislative, economic or other policy and institutional actions that will provide the enabling conditions and incentives necessary to achieve the goals or priority areas and the targets of the NBSAP. More specific actions would be indicative, acknowledging that approaches will need to be adapted in light of experience of implementation. The Plan should determine who does what, where, when and how.

10. **Application of the NBSAP to subnational entities --** How the NBSAP will be implemented at state/provincial level (particularly important for federal countries, or quasi-federal countries which devolve territorial management to these entities) and at local or municipal levels (including cities). The national strategy and action plan might be complemented by LBSAPs developed separately.

11. **Sectoral Action - mainstreaming into development, poverty reduction and climate change plans -** Actions and steps that will be taken to integrate biodiversity into broader national policies, strategies and plans (such as national development plans; poverty reduction strategies; climate change adaptation plans, etc.) and into sectoral policies, strategies and plans, across government, the private sector and civil society.

12. **Plan for capacity development for NBSAP implementation, including a technology needs assessment --** The human and technical needs to implement the NBSAP and how they may be mobilized.

13. **Communication and outreach strategy for the NBSAP. --** How the NBSAP will be promoted in the country among decision makers and the public at large (this is distinct from the CEPA activities of the NBSAP – which would go into the national and subnational actions sub-sections).

14. **Plan for resource mobilization for NBSAP implementation --** The financial resources needed to implement the NBSAP and how they will be mobilized through all sources including the domestic budget, external assistance (where relevant) and innovative financial mechanisms.

15. **National Coordination Structures --** What are the national structures, institutions, and partnerships that will guide, coordinate and ensure implementation of the NBSAP (e.g., national committees, inter-ministerial committees; and Secretariat or unit to support these) with clear identification of roles and responsibilities of various institutional actors. Where relevant, establishment of coordination mechanisms with local authorities in the development and implementation of LBSAPs and/or with regional partners in the case of regional strategies.

16. **Clearing House Mechanism --** Including the development and/or enhancement of the national CHM and how it is being used to support the development and implementation of the NBSAP; development of national (and where relevant regional) institutional network for biodiversity.

17. **Monitoring and Evaluation --** How the implementation of the NBSAP will be monitored and evaluated, including provisions for reporting and the identification of indicators to track progress towards national targets.

Annex II

PLANS FOR THE UPDATING AND REVISION OF NATIONAL BIODIVERSITY STRATEGIES AND ACTION PLANS

Annex 2.1 Summary Table

Country	NBSAP date(s)	Other recent relevant laws and frameworks	Plans to update NBSAP and establish national targets	Plans to integrate NBSAP and targets into national planning processes	Likely channel for GEF-5 support
Bangladesh (bd)	2004	Update provided in 4NR	Will initiate NBSAP revision shortly including setting of national targets	Partial integration into current planning process; full integration into next round.	UNEP umbrella or Direct Access
Bhutan (bt)	1997 2002 2009	National Forest Policy 2011	Will develop addendum to 2009 BAP to harmonize with Aichi Targets by 2012	Targets and updated BAP to be integrated into next 5 year Plan 2013-18 and sectoral plans.	UNEP umbrella or Direct Access
Brunei Darussalam (bn)	None	Forestry Law National Forest Policy	Will integrate Aichi Targets into NBSAP under development	In general, biodiversity is already considered in the LT development plan. Targets can in integrated into ST & MT development plans.	UNDP
Cambodia (kh)	2002	Protected area and biodiversity management framework Protected area law	Updating NBSAP is a priority of the Biodiversity Programme framework endorsed by Minister in April 2011. Will include national targets.	Will be integrated into National Strategic Plan and Rectangular strategy (MT & LT) and sectoral plans (ST, MT and LT)	UNEP umbrella, Direct Access or FAO
China (cn)	1994 2010	12th five year plan.	Existing targets will be reviewed and aligned with Aichi targets. Provincial BSAPs under development.	Possibility of integration into 5yr Environment Plan currently under development.	
India (in)	1999 2008		Will update NBSAP with national targets	Biodiversity value to be integrated into 13th five-year plan (2017-2022)	Direct Access

Country	NBSAP date(s)	Other recent relevant laws and frameworks	Plans to update NBSAP and establish national targets	Plans to integrate NBSAP and targets into national planning processes	Likely channel for GEF-5 support
Indonesia (id)	1993 2003		Detailed plan established for updating NBSAP including target setting	Main elements will be integrated into mid-term national development planning 2010-2014 and into Government annual workplans and budgeting programme (by 2013). Will also be integrated into Provincial planning processes	UNDP
Japan (jp)	1995 2002 2008 2010	Basic Act 2008; Law for promotion of biodiversity conservation activities (December 2010)	Will conduct consultations in 2011 to adopt updated Strategy with national targets in 2012	Will be integrated into local government planning through local BSAPs. Will also incorporate the consideration of biodiversity policies in reconstruction and rebuilding from damage of the Great East Japan Earthquake	not eligible
Republic of Korea (kr)	1997		In June 2011, National working group will be formed to formulate the 3rd NBSAP to be finalized by 2014		not eligible
Lao PDR (la)	2004	Forest Law 2007; wildlife law 2007; PM Decree Forest protection	Plan for updating has been submitted to Ministry (IUCN Lao will provide technical assistance)	Will incorporate NBSAP into National Socio-economic development plan	UNEP umbrella
Malaysia (my)	1998	Common vision adopted by National biodiversity Council chaired by DPM	Will review national policy in 2011-12	Will integrate into next NDP 2016-2020 (Plus partial integration into rolling 2 year plan of current NDP).	UNDP

Country	NBSAP date(s)	Other recent relevant laws and frameworks	Plans to update NBSAP and establish national targets	Plans to integrate NBSAP and targets into national planning processes	Likely channel for GEF-5 support
Maldives (mv)	2002	NEAPIII; SAP (2009-13)	NBSAP review is a priority using Aichi targets as a guiding document	Opportunity to promote integration of biodiversity into Island Council plans that will be developed over next 12 months; Will integrate targets and NBSAP into next SAP	UNEP umbrella (LOE submitted)
Mongolia (mn)	1996	Protected Areas Programme 1998	Will update (as stated in 4NR)	Green economy; poverty reduction (delegate hunting rights)	UNEP umbrella (LOE submitted)
Myanmar (mm)	2002		Ongoing process, draft under revision in light of new government. Expect to be finalized in 2011.	Opportunity to integrate into policies of recently elected local government councils	GEF-4 funds already allocated for NBSAP
Nepal (np)	2002	Agrobiodiversity Policy; Wetland Policy; NBF; draft ABS	Will begin revision this year, Participatory way	Will be integrated into NDP over next 2 years	Umbrella
Pakistan (pk)	1999	Provincial Wildlife Acts (Revised); Provincial and District Conservation Strategies; National Environment Policy; Draft National Forest policy	Government of Pakistan has granted approval of working on revision process and proposal is in process. National targets will be set in the light of CBD Strategic Plan.	BAP Targets are already integrated in existing planning cycles. The Planning Commission considers National and regional issues how BAP, national Five Year plans, MDG are addressed. Annual Plans of planning Commission adopts benchmarks from BAP and other sectoral guiding documents	Probably UNEP (outside of umbrella project)
Philippines (ph)	1997 2002	Logging Ban, REDD+ policy (also see notes)	Will start this year. Interim targets this year to feed into new NDP and NBSAP	Philippine dev plan 2011-2016 being finalized including interim BD targets	UNDP

Country	NBSAP date(s)	Other recent relevant laws and frameworks	Plans to update NBSAP and establish national targets	Plans to integrate NBSAP and targets into national planning processes	Likely channel for GEF-5 support
Singapore (sg)	1992 2002 2009	The Endangered Species Act 2006 Parks and Trees Act 2005 Inter-Ministerial Committee on Sustainable Development (IMCSD) Parks and Waterbodies Plan of the URA Master Plan 2008	Next review will be completed by 2014; interim report will be prepared for COP-11	Conservation of biodiversity rich areas are taken into consideration in the master planning process; the next Master Plan review will be conducted in 2014, in line with the NBSAP review process	UNEP umbrella
Sri Lanka (sl)	1998		Will prepare addendum to BCAP including targets to be validated through stakeholder workshops	Possibility to integrate biodiversity concerns into ST national plan (annual plans)	UNDP (tbc)
Thailand (th)	1997 2002 2008	Measures on Preventing, Control and Eradication of Alien Species (2008); Two years BAP 2010-11; Regulation on Access and Benefit Sharing (2011)	NBSAP-4: 2013-2017	Aichi Targets to be integrated into 4th NESDP 2012-2016	Set Aside (Direct Access)
Timor Leste (tl)	under prepar-ation	Environmental License decree; Biodiversity Decree and PA Decree to be finalized Sept 2011; Environment framework law and policy and strategy being drafted	The first NBSAP under preparation will incorporate Aichi targets	Will try to integrate NBSAP into new polices when new government installed in 2012.	Umbrella for add-ons
Vietnam (vn)	1994 2007	Laws on fisheries, forests, biodiversity; Environment Protection Strategy to 2010 and orientation to 2020	Update is a high priority, including targets.	Phase 1 2012-15 (ST); phase II 2015-2020 (LT)	UNDP (with MSP spatial planning)

Annex 2.2

COUNTRY PLANS FOR THE UPDATING OF NBSAPS, SETTING NATIONAL TARGETS AND INTEGRATING INTO NATIONAL PLANNING PROCESSES (A SUMMARY IS PROVIDED IN ANNEX. 2.1)

BANGLADESH (Mohammed Solaiman Haider)

Date(s) of preparation/revision of NBSAP:
2003-04

Recent related biodiversity policies, frameworks or laws:
Bangladesh developed Biodiversity National Assessment and Programme of Action 2020

Plans for revising and updating the NBSAP and setting national targets in line with the Aichi Biodiversity Targets:
Bangladesh is planning to update the NBSAP with the impetus of the COP-10 decisions within next one year. During consultation for updating NBSAP, the Aichi targets will be analyzed to set the national targets

Opportunities for integrating the national targets and updated strategy into national plans and policies for development and poverty eradication:
Integrating NBSAP into national development planning process has already been initiated. The full integration may take further 5 years.

Plans to access GEF funds for NBSAP revision:
Bangladesh is opted for direct access to GEF fund. If the direct access opportunity cannot be availed Bangladesh may join the other funding windows through UNEP or UNDP. Very soon after the workshop the country enabling activities format will be filled in to get the endorsement of the operational focal point.

BHUTAN (Karma C. Nyerdrup & Singay dorji)

Date(s) of preparation/revision of NBSAP
1997; 2002; 2009

Recent related biodiversity policies, frameworks or laws:
National forestry policy-April 2011

Plans for revising and updating the NBSAP and setting national targets in line with the Aichi Biodiversity Targets:
Will develop addendum to 2009 BAP to harmonize with Aichi Targets by 2012. For setting national targets will undertake awareness and education, conduct extensive consultation with stakeholders.

Opportunities for integrating the national targets and updated strategy into national plans and policies for development and poverty eradication:
Targets and updated BAP to be integrated into next 5 year Plan 2013-18 and sectoral plans.

Plans to access GEF funds for NBSAP revision
Bhutan is considering two options GEF umbrella project and direct access.

Possible National Targets (part of response to Aichi target 2):
- adoption of national plan on biodiversity and climate change by 2011
- setting up of national targets by 2012
- update the BAP-III of 2009 by 2012
- incorporation of targets international and sectoral plans - July 2013-2018

BRUNEI DARUSSALAM (Noralinda HJ Ibrahim , Yudima Yueh)

Date(s) of preparation/revision of NBSAP
Brunei Darussalam does not have NBSAP yet and still in the process for formulating one.

Recent related biodiversity policies, frameworks or laws:
Biodiversity conservation and development concerns are strongly provided for by the Forestry Law and the National Forestry Policy.

Plans for revising and updating the NBSAP and setting national targets in line with the Aichi Biodiversity Targets:
If eligible, Brunei Darussalam intends to use the GEF Enabling Fund to prepare the country's first NBSAP. The provisions provided for by the Aichi Strategic Plan and Target will be of important considerations in the formulation of Brunei Darussalam's NBSAP. The setting of national targets in line with Aichi Biodiversity Targets will be determined through the following processes:

- Assessment of national biodiversity resources
- Identify national priorities actions and targets
- National consultation with stakeholders
- Institutional capacity building and outreach programme on Aichi Targets
- Networking with stakeholders
- National targets have to be applicable, realistic, and achievable
  targets and updated strategy into national plans and policies for development and poverty eradication

Opportunities for integrating the national targets and updated strategy into national plans and policies for development and poverty eradication:
In general, the environment and biodiversity concerns and strategies are properly considered in the Brunei Darussalam Long-term Development Plan (Wawasan Brunei 2035). The integration of national targets and strategies on biodiversity will be best considered at the short and medium term development plans.

Plans to access GEF funds for NBSAP revision:

UNDP. Brunei Darussalam needs the necessary technical assistance in preparing its first NBSAP

CAMBODIA (Ms. Somaly Chan and Mr. Meng Monyrak)

Date(s) of preparation/revision of NBSAP
April 2002

Recent related biodiversity policies, frameworks or laws:

- Biodiversity Management Framework
- Protected Area Law
- National Strategic Plan
- Royal Government Rectangular Strategy

Plans for revising and updating the NBSAP and setting national targets in line with the Aichi Biodiversity Targets:
Cambodia plan to use GEF Enabling Fund to revise NBSAP to comply with the Aichi Strategic Plan and Target. The revise NBSAP is one priority in our Biodiversity Programme Framework which was endorsed by Senior Minister in last month.
For setting of national targets in line with the Aichi Biodiversity Targets:

- Organize national consolation
- Capacity building and publication on Aichi Targets
- Build networking and establish national coordination mechanism including civil society and ILC
- Identify national priorities actions and targets
- National targets have to be applicable, realistic, and achievable, but in line with Aichi targets.

Opportunities for integrating the national targets and updated strategy into national plans and policies for development and poverty eradication:

- Medium term (2011-2014) and long term (2011-2020) national strategic environment plans
- Short, medium & ling terms sectoral plans (to be finalized in 2011)

Plans to access GEF funds for NBSAP revision
Cambodia is considering direct access.

Possible National Targets (part of response to Aichi target 2):
By 2020, biodiversity values taken into account in diversity laws and related regulations.
By 2015, my domestic values have been promoted through implementation of cross sectoral and sectoral strategic plans, policy and framework.
By 2020, communities have become aware of my dynasty values that contribute to and support their livelihoods, poverty reduction programmes and the national GDP.

CHINA

Date(s) of preparation/revision of NBSAP
1993; 2010

Recent related biodiversity policies, frameworks or laws:

12th five-year plan.

Plans for revising and updating the NBSAP and setting national targets in line with the Aichi Biodiversity Targets:
Existing targets will be reviewed and aligned with Aichi targets. Provincial BSAPs under development.

Opportunities for integrating the national targets and updated strategy into national plans and policies for development and poverty eradication:

Possibility of integration into 5yr Environment Plan currently under development.

INDIA (Dr Indrani Chandrasekharan & Dr Sujata Arora)

Date(s) of preparation/revision of NBSAP
1999; 2008

Recent related biodiversity policies, frameworks or laws:

Plans for revising and updating the NBSAP and setting national targets in line with the Aichi Biodiversity Targets:
It is proposed to update in the NBAP 2008 in the light of COP-10 decision on strategic plan. National targets to be identified in line with the Aichi biodiversity targets in consultation with relevant stakeholders. These would then be integrated into the NBAP.

Opportunities for integrating the national targets and updated strategy into national plans and policies for development and poverty eradication:
The plans are prepared every five years. A mid-term appraisal after three years is done and targets/ procedures can be revised. The 12th plan preparation process is on. The targets are fixed before the plan period of 2012 the preparation phase is in time to integrate and incorporate national targets.

Plans to access GEF funds for NBSAP revision
Direct Access proposal already prepared and will be submitted imminently.

Possible National Targets (part of response to Aichi target 2):
Biodiversity value to be integrated into national planning process by the end of 13 five-year plan (2017-2022)
Intermediate target:

- Model for green domestic product to be prepared by COP-11
- Framework agreement National accounts to be developed towards the middle of 12th five-year plan (2012-2017)

Integration of national target at provincial state level:

- Greening of gross states domestic product to be accomplished in at least 50% of the 28th provisional states towards the end of the 13th five-year plan period (2017-2022).

Integration of national target into poverty reduction strategies:

- By 2012, 80% of the working plans for forests to be prepared by provincial states, that would contribute towards livelihood security of 200 million tourist dependent people.

INDONESIA (Sudhinai Pratiwi and Bambang Nooryanto)

Date(s) of preparation/revision of NBSAP
1993; 2004

Recent related biodiversity policies, frameworks or laws:
In term of planning development, related biodiversities policies and laws are included in:

- Mid Term National Development Planning 2004-2009 (Presidential Decree No.7/2005)

- Mid Term National Development Planning 2010-2014 (Presidential Decree No.5/2010)
- Government Annual Workplan 2010 (Presidential Decree No.21/2009)
- Government Annual Workplan 2011 (Presidential Decree No.29/2010)
- Act 32/2009 on Protecting and Environment management
- Government Regulation 24/2010 on Use of Forest Area
- Government Regulation 2 /2008 on tax

Plans for revising and updating the NBSAP and setting national targets in line with the Aichi Biodiversity Targets:
If resources and political will support are available we may update our current NBSAP trough the following proposed process:

- Review the effectiveness of the current Indonesia Biodiversity Strategy and Action Plan (IBSAP) 2004-2020
- Take into account government acts and regulations listed above
- establish stock taking team to gather current data & information on biodiversity related issue
- Identify and map stakeholders roles and activities as well as gather their input
- Develop and establish mechanism as well as tools for stakeholders involvement, participation and commitment
- Identify related targets, activities & action plans in other related conventions that had been ratified by the Government of Indonesia (GOI)
- Identify related programme, strategies and action plans in related local and national institutions to be included in update National IBSAP
- Update the IBSAP based on current laws and regulations as well as current issues on environment (such as Aichi Target, Resource Mobilization, climate change, etc.)
- Develop and establish a mechanism for community outreach.

We need to make national agreement with government institutions to measure indicator succeed from achievement of each target in the 2010 Target NBSAP. Indonesia has national report for evaluation implementation national target. The Fourth National Report to CBD is a report on the implementation of articles and programmes of work of the Convention on Biological Biodiversity (CBD) at the national level. Results from the evaluation in the 4NR can base on for update NBSAP and integration with Aichi target.

Process for setting national targets in line with the Aichi Biodiversity Targets.

- Identified & analyze the similarities of local, national, and the Aichi Targets
- Develop and establish local and national agreement (commitment)to reach the agreed targets
- Develop and establish institutional arrangement
- etc

Opportunities for integrating the national targets and updated strategy into national plans and policies for development and poverty eradication:
The new updated NBSAP could be a source to develop the next Mid Term National Development Planning (2015-2019) as well as Government Annual Workplan

Plans to access GEF funds for NBSAP revision
Will access funds, probably through UNDP.
GEF operational focal point: Mr. Dana A. Kartakusuma, Special Adviser for Ministry of Environment

Possible National Targets (part of response to Aichi target 2):
Integrating biodiversity values international as well as local development planning processes
A: national planning cycles

- by 2013 we can integrate biodiversity values into government yearly development planning programme as well as national budgeting programme;
- by 2015 by domestic values will be integrated into mid-term development planning programme (2015-2019)

B: integration into local levels
We have bottom-up planning mechanisms through:

- district and provincial level meeting on development planning (March-April every year)
- financial mechanism (I) financial mechanism: A –special budget at provincial level for monitoring; (ii) special budget at district level for implementation;

C: tools for integration (SEA, law, etc.)

- SEA – joint ministerial decree;
- law number 32 (2009) on the environmental protection and management;
- regional IBSAP;
- spatial planning - law number 26 (2007) on special planning;
- EIA - environmental impact assessment (government regulation number 27 (1999)

JAPAN (Mr. Yuki Iwasa, Ministry of the Environment)
Date(s) of preparation/revision of NBSAP
1995; 2002; 2008; 2010.

Recent related biodiversity policies, frameworks or laws:
Basic Act on Biodiversity (June, 2008)
The Law for the Promotion of biodiversity conservation activities (December, 2010)

Plans for revising and updating the NBSAP and setting national targets in line with the Aichi Biodiversity Targets:
(2011): Social gatherings/group meetings with various experts on the subject, round-table talks throughout the nation, hearings from experts on the subject, and so forth.
-> Issues for the next national strategy will be organized and clarified.
(2012) : Examination and review at the Central Environmental Council, Public hearings, and so forth.
-> Update the National Biodiversity Strategy and Action Plan (NBSAP) of Japan, aiming to have approval from the Cabinet in September 2012.

Concerning the setting of national targets in line with the Aichi Biodiversity Targets we plan to review the entire structure of the national strategy in order to make it a roadmap to the achievement of the Aichi Biodiversity Targets, through, for example, the fulfillment of milestones and indicators.

- Identifying and Engaging Stakeholders (Increasing momentum for revision)
- Evaluating Implementation of the NBSAP
- Cross-cutting argument in collaboration with each ministry and agency concerned

Concerning the development of indicators and monitoring approach, through reviews on the current NBSAP, we aim to clarify the issues, and its causes, and the implementation state of measures and to enhance the system to reflect them in the next strategy.

Opportunities for integrating the national targets and updated strategy into national plans and policies for development and reconstruction:
Incorporate the consideration of biodiversity policies in reconstruction/rebuilding from damage of the Great East Japan Earthquake.
Improve policies for the mainstreaming biodiversity

- Holds the periodic the Inter-Ministerial Committee on the National Biodiversity Strategy of Japan
- MOE attends the meeting for revising other national plans and advising with regard to updated NBSAP.

Basic Act on Biodiversity (June, 2008)

- Article 12(1) The National Biodiversity Strategy shall be formulated based on the Basic Environment Plan prescribed in Article 15(1) of the Environment Basic Law.
- Article 12 (2) National plans other than the Basic Environment Plan and the National Biodiversity Strategy shall be based on the National Biodiversity Strategy with regard to conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity.

Possible National Targets (part of response to Aichi target 2):
2011- 2020

- Civil society

o Enhance public awareness of biodiversity and promote initiatives by the private sector(national committee for UNDB, Satoyama Initiative – increase awareness by promoting education

- Local strategy: Setting local biodiversity strategy at local government level

Provision of baseline input on economic valuation during the process

LAO PDR (Mr. Bouaphanh Phanthavong)

Date(s) of preparation/revision of NBSAP
April 2004.

Recent related biodiversity policies, frameworks or laws:
Forestry Law revised and endorsed by National Assembly , December 2007.
Wildlife Law, December 2007.
Prime Minister Degree on Forest Protection

Plans for revising and updating the NBSAP and setting national targets in line with the Aichi Biodiversity Targets:
The plan for revising and updating the NBSAP prepared and submitted to the Ministry of Agriculture and Forestry for approval. IUCN Lao committed to provide technical support for the revising and updating process. For setting national targets in line with the Aichi Biodiversity Targets:
- Technical working group including all stakeholders will be formulated
- Brainstorming through consultation workshop.

Opportunities for integrating the national targets and updated strategy into national plans and policies for development and poverty eradication:
Incorporate NBSAP into National socio-economic development plan.

Plans to access GEF funds for NBSAP revision
Probably through UNEP Umbrella Project

KOREA, REPUBLIC OF

Date(s) of preparation/revision of NBSAP:
1997

Recent related biodiversity policies, frameworks or laws:

Plans for revising and updating the NBSAP and setting national targets in line with the Aichi Biodiversity Targets:
In June 2011, National working group will be formed to formulate the 3rd NBSAP to be finalized by 2014.

Possible National Targets (part of response to Aichi target 2):
In June 2011, National working group will be formed to formulate the 3rd NBSAP and produce new national report.
By 2014, the 3rd NBSAP will be finalized.
Maintain capacity of the ecosystem to deliver goods and services:
- Ecotourism: e.g. visiting national parks, creating education facilities and national ecology and culture tour roads for the expansion of eco-tourism and creating greater demand and consulting an eco-phone system.
- Use of positive incentives: e.g. implementing positive incentives, such as the expansion of the support project for biodiversity management agreements, etc.

MALAYSIA (Saw Leng Guan and Noor Haliza Abdul Halim)

Date(s) of preparation/revision of NBSAP
1998 and has not been revised since.

Recent related biodiversity policies, frameworks or laws:
A common vision on Biodiversity in government and the development process has been adopted by National Biodiversity Council chaired by the Deputy Prime Minister to main stream biodiversity into government and development process.

Plans for revising and updating the NBSAP and setting national targets in line with the Aichi Biodiversity Targets:
Malaysia will be reviewing its National Policy on Biological Diversity in 2011-2012 (depending on availability of funding). This will be its first revision since Malaysia launched its national policy on biological diversity in 1998. In the light of COP-10, Malaysia will be using GEF funds to update the Malaysian biodiversity policy and develop its own national targets in relation to the Aichi Targets.

It is expected that the setting national targets in line with the Aichi Biodiversity Targets will be done in a series of consultative processes involving different stakeholders in the country. The process will include explanation of the Aichi Biodiversity Targets and how the targets could be adapted to the Malaysian situation.

Opportunities for integrating the national targets and updated strategy into national plans and policies for development and poverty eradication:
Malaysia development plan runs for a period of 5 years and the next Malaysian plan will start from 2016-2020. Thus, there is enough time to update the strategy and national plans and policies into the Malaysian Plan. However, the current Malaysian Plan is based on 2 year rolling plan instead of 5 year. This will also give some opportunities to allow integration of national targets and strategy into the current national plan.

Plans to access GEF funds for NBSAP revision
Malaysia will be applying GEF funds for the NBSAP revision, probably from UNDP.
GEF operational focal point is Dr Lian Kok Fei from the Environmental Management and Climate Change Division, Ministry of Natural Resources and Environment.

Possible National Targets (part of response to Aichi target 2):
And by 2020, by diversity values including ecosystem services, protection of threatened and endangered species, and habitats, are included as national priorities and accounted for in the 10th and 11th Malaysia plans.

MALDIVES (Ilham Atho Mohamed)

Date(s) of preparation/revision of NBSAP
2002

Recent related biodiversity policies, frameworks or laws:
NEAPIII; SAP (2009-13)

Plans for revising and updating the NBSAP and setting national targets in line with the Aichi Biodiversity Targets:
NBSAP review is a priority using Aichi targets as a guiding document

Opportunities for integrating the national targets and updated strategy into national plans and policies for development and poverty eradication:
Opportunity to promote integration of biodiversity into Island Council plans that will be developed over next 12 months; Will integrate targets and NBSAP into next SAP

Plans to access GEF funds for NBSAP revision
Through UNEP umbrella (LOE submitted already)

MONGOLIA (Gantumur Davaadorj, Dorjgotov Baldan)

Date(s) of preparation/revision of NBSAP
The Mongolian Biodiversity National Programme approved by the Government in 10th July, 1996

Recent related biodiversity policies, frameworks or laws:
- The National Programme on Protected Area/1998/
- The National Programme on water /1999/, it is revised in 2010
- The National Programme on Forest /2001/
- The National Programme on Protection and Usage of the Mongolian rare flora
- The National Programme on Protection and Fisheries
- The law on fauna /2000/
- The law on hunting /2000/
- The law on modified organism /2007/
- The law on Forest

Plans for revising and updating the NBSAP and setting national targets in line with the Aichi Biodiversity Targets:
We are preparing to revise the National Programme on Mongolian Biodiversity at the moment. In the revised National Programme, we have planned to focus on COP-10 and this workshop's results and targets. Also we have focus on Aichi Biodiversity Targets to Mongolian National Programme on Biodiversity. See attached presentation.

Opportunities for integrating the national targets and updated strategy into national plans and policies for development and poverty eradication:
Taking in to account the timetable for national planning cycles, we are planning to integrate the following issues:
- Transition toward traditional economy to green economy
- To provide connection between Biodiversity and poverty reduction in local administration level. It means, to delegate some management and permission allocating system of hunting wild animal and usage flora in local administration and local society and partnership.
- To develop eco-tourism through biodiversity programme

Plans to access GEF funds for NBSAP revision
Through UNEP umbrella (LOE submitted already)
GEF focal point who is Mr.Enkhbat.A working in the Ministry of Nature, Environment and Tourism as a head of the Division of Ecological clean technology and Science.

MYANMAR (Ohn Lwin, Deputy Director, Forest Research Institute, Ministry of Forestry)

Date(s) of preparation/revision of NBSAP
First draft of Myanmar-NBSAP was prepared in 2010 and on going updating it. Most of the policies (not only to biodiversity) are recently updating due to government reforming in Myanmar. Preparation and updating NBSAP in Myanmar is required time to be finished during transitional phase of government reforming recently since 1 April, 2011. We are also expecting to facilitate among stakeholders.

Plans for revising and updating the NBSAP and setting national targets in line with the Aichi Biodiversity Targets:
In order to update the current-on-going NBSAP, workshop was held at Forest Department in March, 2011. Outcomes from stakeholder will be more aligned with COP-10 and Aichi-framework in addition to contribute regional targets. There is on-going process of developing NBSAP and expected to finish by end of July, 2011. COP10 Targets are to integrate in present NBSAP. The issue of setting national targets in line with the Aichi Biodiversity Targets will be addressed:
- Capacity building and management,
- Weak institutional consultation/cooperation/linkage, Networking,
- Not concrete and consistent focal person from each stakeholder due to changing government system in transition,
- Political commitment is a key to set up national target as fiscal policy need to be adjusted for allocating budget for NBSAP framework multi-sectoral activity

Opportunities for integrating the national targets and updated strategy into national plans and policies for development and poverty eradication:
In very near future, national plans and policies for all-round development of Myanmar will be more practical, and NBSAP would be more emphasized for long term sustainable development in Myanmar, as well as trend of all plans and actions are more integrated and paralleled to support biodiversity conservation, benefit sharing and contribute climate change towards poverty eradication . Recently, new elected government is emerged for the term of 2011 to 2015. NBSAP is to be approved by legislative body (Bicameral Parliament) and executive branch is to implement. This political system change open the opportunity for all line Ministry to put forward the agenda of NBSAP in the parliament for their endorsement to allocate more budget for sustainable development (including the agenda of Biodiversity) and poverty eradication. Newly elected president has also officially publicized their promise to improve the environmental law and conservation activity in next 5 years so that space has been enlarged for integrating biodiversity and environmental conservation into economic development process.

Possible National Targets (part of response to Aichi target 2):
- By 2010 NBSAP 1st draft
- By 2011, refine NBSAP, setting timeline, publish in June, capacity development, strengthen national coordination
- By 2012, valuation of ecosystem service at local level for short-term, medium and long-term
- By 2013, implementation at national, subnational entities, revise NBSAP, target
- 2014- COP12

NEPAL (Krishna)
Date(s) of preparation/revision of NBSAP

2002

Recent related biodiversity policies, frameworks or laws:
Agrobiodiversity policy
Wetlands policy
National biosafety framework
ABS (draft).

Plans for revising and updating the NBSAP and setting national targets in line with the Aichi Biodiversity Targets:
In the current year (2011) we plan to begin realizing the NBSAP are through a multi-stakeholder committee which will work in a participatory way. The issue of setting national targets in line with the Aichi Biodiversity Targets will be addressed through the existing national biodiversity committee where stakeholders will be engaged in the process. National targets will be set through a consultative process.

Opportunities for integrating the national targets and updated strategy into national plans and policies for development and poverty eradication:
The timing for updating NBSAP and it's mainstreaming through National development plan will take another two years.

Plans to access GEF funds for NBSAP revision
Probably through UNEP Umbrella.

PAKISTAN (Abdul Hamid Marwat & Dr. Rizwan Irshad)

Date(s) of preparation/revision of NBSAP
2000.

Recent related biodiversity policies, frameworks or laws:
Provincial Wildlife Acts (Revised)
Provincial and District Conservation Strategies
National Environment Policy
Draft National Forest policy
National Vision 2030

Plans for revising and updating the NBSAP and setting national targets in line with the Aichi Biodiversity Targets:
Government of Pakistan has granted approval of working on revision process and proposal is in process. National targets will be set in the light of CBD Strategic Plan keeping in view the national requirements and strategy papers.

Opportunities for integrating the national targets and updated strategy into national plans and policies for development and poverty eradication:
PSDP/ADP/Five Years people's plan 2011-2016, Vision 2030
MDG Targets and BAP Targets are already integrated in existing cycles. Planning Commission considers National and regional issues how BAP, national Five Year plans, MDG are addressed.
Annual Plans of planning Commission adopts benchmarks from BAP (existing), and other sectoral guiding documents. In future, similar practice will continue and last agreed Five Years Plan contains specific chapter on environment that are exclusively the domain of the Ministry of Environment, and finally became part of the Planning Commission's document. As more provincial autonomy is granted to provinces under the 18th amendment in constitution, it is expected that the provinces will be taking lead role in formulating their policies, funding plans and capacity building exercises. Though a national plan, the provincial targets and plans will be highlighted, in some way. Pakistan's team working on BAP revision will have to look similar situation in some other countries and look into possibility to following similar solution.

Plans to access GEF funds for NBSAP revision
focal point? Are you familiar with the GEF-5 template for enabling activities?
GEF Operational Focal Point is Ministry of Environment, Islamabad and Biodiversity Directorate works closely with the office of GEF OFP. Pakistan has decided to work on revision of BAP with financial assistance of GEF through UNEP as Executing Agency

PHILIPPINES (Ms. Meriden E. Maranan, Mr. Nheden Amiel Sarne and Ms. Nancy R. Corpuz)

Date(s) of preparation/revision of NBSAP
The Philippine NBSAP was prepared and published in 1997. In 2002, the Philippines has prepared and published the Philippine Biodiversity Priorities (PBCP): An Iteration of the NBSAP. The PBCP focuses more on updating the strategies as well as on the geographic priorities by identifying the Key Biodiversity Areas (KBA) in the country.

Recent related biodiversity policies, frameworks or laws:
Some recent frameworks/laws/policies include the following:
- Philippine Development Plan for 2011-2016 (finalization on-going)
- National Framework Strategy on Climate Change
- Philippine Strategy on Climate Change Adaptation
- National Climate Change Action Plan (for finalization)
- Executive Order 23 re: Logging Ban in Natural Forest
- Philippine National REDD Plus Strategy

Plans for revising and updating the NBSAP and setting national targets in line with the Aichi Biodiversity Targets:
The Philippines plans to start the revision of the NBSAP this year (2011) or as soon as funding is available. The revision will focus on identifying national indicators and targets based on the Strategic Plan on Biodiversity for 2011-2020, the guidelines and procedures to be discussed in the China workshop, and the current policies, macro plans and programmes of the Philippine government such as those enumerated in item 1. Updating process will involve stocktaking of relevant information on biodiversity particularly the 4th National Report to the CBD; identification of gaps in the existing NBSAP and its iteration; conduct of stakeholders' consultation workshops nationwide; and finalization and publication of the revised NBSAP.
In the preparation of the Philippine Development Plan for 2011-2016, we have initially incorporated programmes and activities in line with achieving the Aichi Biodiversity Targets. Details of the national targets though shall be provided further in the NBSAP revision. However, our main constraint in setting the national targets is the lack of baseline information in some areas of management and standards for monitoring progress of implementation. Given this, setting national targets will be undertaken based on the relevant biodiversity studies undertaken or reports such as the 4th National Report to the Convention on Biodiversity (4NR), National Capacity Self Assessment on the implementation of the CBD where gaps on biodiversity-related capacities were identified.
While we believe all of the identified components are important in the whole process of NBSAP development and implementation, if we are made to select the most important, at this point, it is the setting of national priorities and targets through national and subnational consultations. With the adoption of the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity for 2011-2020 at the CBD COP-10, we should be able to immediately translate this into national targets and indicators so that stakeholders in the country could identify their respective roles/contributions to achieve the targets.

Opportunities for integrating the national targets and updated strategy into national plans and policies for development and poverty eradication:
With the onset of the new administration in June 2010, the Philippines has initiated the preparation of the Philippine Development Plan (PDP) for 2011-2016 which is now in the final stages of completion. National targets and strategies on biodiversity are already incorporated in the Plan. Under Chapter 10 of the PDP, targets and strategies on biodiversity are provided under Goal 1 Improve Conservation Protection and Rehabilitation of Natural Resources and in Goal 3 Enhanced resilience of natural systems and improved adaptive capacities of human communities to cope with environmental hazards including climate-related risks. Specifically under Goal 1, improving protection and conservation of biodiversity is a priority. In terms of policies, there are proposed policies in the medium term that would contribute to enhance protection and conservation of biodiversity and also poverty reduction. These include the proposed National Land Use Policy, Sustainable Forest Management Act, Presidential Proclamation or enactment of laws on the establishment of priority protected areas and the policy on Integrated Coastal Management.

While we believe all of the identified components are important in the whole process of NBSAP development and implementation, if we are made to select the most important, at this point, it is the setting of national priorities and targets through national and subnational consultations. With the adoption of the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity for 2011-2020 at the CBD COP-10, we should be able to immediately translate this into national targets and indicators so that stakeholders in the country could identify their respective roles/contributions to achieve the targets.

Plans to access GEF funds for NBSAP revision
Due to the huge amount of resources needed in the process of updating the NBSAP, the Philippines would want to access the GEF funds to facilitate its target completion by 2012, probably through UNDP.

GEF Operational Focal Point, Assistant Secretary Analiza R. Teh of the Department of Environment and Natural Resources .

Possible National Targets (part of response to Aichi target 2):

- by 2011, revision of NBSAP
- By 2012, issuance of EO directing mainstreaming NBSAP into national/ local levels
- By 2012, mainstreaming into ACD/CLUP
- By 2013, mid-term review/ updating of the Philippines Development Plan (PDP) and integrating NBSAP into the PDP
- NBSAP integrated into the Municipal Development Plan (MDP)
- PES institutionalized and operationalized in protected areas
- Valuation/ Accounting studies conducted for species and ecosystem services

SINGAPORE (Linda Goh & Muslim Anshari Rahman)

Date(s) of preparation/revision of NBSAP

Singapore launched its first NBSAP in 2009. Before that the Singapore Green Plan (2002), the national blueprint for environmental sustainability served as Singapore's NBSAP.

Plans for revising and updating the NBSAP and setting national targets in line with the Aichi Biodiversity Targets:

Singapore is due to revise/update its NBSAP by 2014 to coincide with the Urban Redevelopment Authority's review of "The Master Plan"- the national land-use plan. The review of the NBSAP will incorporate the Aichi Biodiversity Targets, and apply the Singapore Index on Cities' Biodiversity as a monitoring tool to track progress made in achieving the national targets.

Opportunities for integrating the national targets and updated strategy into national plans and policies for development and poverty eradication:

We are aligning our review of the NBSAP with the review of the national master planning process. The current master planning process takes into account conservation of biodiversity, and this will continue in the next review process.

Plans to access GEF funds for NBSAP revision

Singapore is eligible for GEF funding under the UNEP Umbrella project and will assess our funding requirements for the NBSAP review. Singapore currently does not have a GEF focal point, and we will adhere to the necessary procedures for GEF funding application.

Possible examples of National Targets (part of response to Aichi target 2):

- By 2014, valuation of ecosystem services are incorporated into national accounting process - Singapore Index;
- By 2014, 22 Natural Areas are maintained under the special and protected control plan (master plan)
- By 2014, the number of Nature Areas are increased to 24 under the Master Plan.

SRI LANKA (Gamini Gamage)

Date(s) of preparation/revision of NBSAP

1998

Plans for revising and updating the NBSAP and setting national targets in line with the Aichi Biodiversity Targets:

To revise the 2nd update (Addendum to BCAP) with considering Aichi BD 2010 targets
The issue of setting national targets in line with the Aichi Biodiversity Targets will be addressed through holding stakeholder consultation, to assess how much can be achieved for the targets (validation of targets with national level stakeholders). NBSAP will comprise (a) Strategy, and (b) Action Plan at national level; (c) Action Plan at Provincial level; and (d) monitoring and evaluation section.

Opportunities for integrating the national targets and updated strategy into national plans and policies for development and poverty eradication:

Possibility to integrate biodiversity concerns into ST national plan (annual plans)
To obtain GEF funds US$50,000 [sic] for NBSAP update. MoE is the GEF OFP. I am familiar with GEF templates.Request to obtain expert in CBD Secretariat fro NBSAP update

Possible National Targets (part of response to Aichi target 2):

1. Implementation of projects to include the biodiversity values into national accounting system.
2. Published by little values in the central bank reports one of the priority areas
3. developed human capacity of national planning and finance ministries to address the issues of valuation of biodiversity and integrate into national planning process.
4. Develop capacity evaluating department to address the modern techniques of the valuation of biodiversity.
5. Strengthening the provisional and local government institutes to address the issue of including idealist evaluation in provincial and local level planning process.
6. Value the biodiversity with special emphasis on cultural, social, and ethical areas and to identify potential for income generation.

THAILAND (Ms. Saracha Roonsiri and Ms. Usaras Janpakdee)

Date(s) of preparation/revision of NBSAP
1997; 2002; 15 January 2008

Recent related biodiversity policies, frameworks or laws:
There are several related biodiversity framework and registration recently such as Measures on Preventing, Control and Eradication of Alien Species (2008), Two years (2010-2011) Biodiversity Action Plan toward COP-11, Regulation of the National Committee on the Conservation and Sustainable Use of Biodiversity on Criteria and Method of Access and Benefit-Sharing of Biological Resource (2011).

Plans for revising and updating the NBSAP and setting national targets in line with the Aichi Biodiversity Targets:
The fourth NBSAP(2013-2017) is on process updating in line with Aichi – Nagoya Strategic Plan and Targets. The issue of setting national targets in line with the Aichi Biodiversity Targets will be addressed through:
- Publication for Aichi Targets
- Capacity Building related stakeholders
- Identification and seek for priorities Targets and Actions
- Finding the main agencies to drive for achieving the targets

Opportunities for integrating the national targets and updated strategy into national plans and policies for development and poverty eradication:
Thailand 11th National Economic and Social Development Plan (2012-2016) is on process (final draft). The Aichi targets was informed to the National Economic and Social Development Board who's taking care of this plan.

Plans to access GEF funds for NBSAP revision
Thailand is considering whether apply for GEF funds for NBSAP or other BD implementing programmes.

Possible National Targets (part of response to Aichi target 2):
- 2013-2017 4th NBSAP**4**
- 2012-2015 final draft of environmental management plan

TIMOR-L'ESTE (Augusto Manuel Pinto, Mario Fransisco Coreia Ximenes)

Date(s) of preparation/revision of NBSAP
First NBSAP under preparation.

Recent related biodiversity policies, frameworks or laws:
a) There is an Environmental License Decree law in place, No. 5/2011.
b) There are a Protected Areas Decree Law and a Biodiversity Decree Law currently in the process of being drafted. These are both expected to be finalized in September 2011.
c) An Environmental Framework law is currently being drafted and expected to be finished at the end of this year.
d) An Environmental Policy and Strategy Plan is currently being drafted.

Plans for revising and updating the NBSAP and setting national targets in line with the Aichi Biodiversity Targets:
The NBSAP is under way but we will incorporate the Strategic Plan that was adopted at COP-10. The Aichi Biodiversity Targets will be used to serve as guidelines to be included in the NBSAP and the Biodiversity Decree Law.

Opportunities for integrating the national targets and updated strategy into national plans and policies for development and poverty eradication:
The National Plans and Policies will be revised at the moment the new Government will be installed in September 2012. They will revise the national strategies and plans and the National Directorate for Environment, will lobby to get the NBSAP mainstreamed into these national policies.

Plans to access GEF funds for NBSAP revision
The GEF funds for NBSAP revision are not available for Timor-Leste since it is still in the process of preparing the first NBSAP. The GEF operational focal point has been appointed but will most probably be replaced in the next few months.

Possible National Targets (part of response to Aichi target 2):
Biodiversity values; Forests, fisheries, agriculture, etc.
Issues: Deforestation and sedimentation; slash and burn; illegal fishing
Approaches: Stakeholder engagement ongoing by 2017; public consultation and awareness campaign ongoing by 2020; consultation with political leaders (2011 to 2012); setup institution (Ministry of environment) by 2012 to 2013; law and regulations will be in place by 2015; reforestation activities ongoing through to 2020.

VIETNAM (Mr. Tran Trong Anh Tuan; Mr. Nguyen Anh Tuan)
Date(s) of preparation/revision of NBSAP
1994; 2010

Recent related biodiversity policies, frameworks or laws:
Are there any recent related biodiversity policies, frameworks or laws?
- Law on Fisheries
- Law on Forestry Protection and Development
- Law on Biodiversity
- Vietnam Environment Protection Strategy up to 2010 and orientation towards 2020.

Vietnam plans to look for support to GEF for revising and updating the NBSAP. Update NBSAP is high priority for biodiversity conservation in the future.

Opportunities for integrating the national targets and updated strategy into national plans and policies for development and poverty eradication:
- Phase 1: 2012 – 2015 (for short - term objective)
- Phase 2: 2015 – 2020 (for long - term objective)

Plans to access GEF funds for NBSAP revision
Vietnam plans to access GEF fund for NBSAP revision, probably through UNDP linked to MSP on spatial planning. GEF focal point of Vietnam in Ministry of Natural Resources and Environment.

Some potential targets:
- To complete the organizational system, mechanisms, policies and legal documents on biodiversity conservation.
- Endangered, rare and prioritized for protection species are conserved
- Genetic resources are invented, stored, and conserved effectively
- Mobilize community participation and private sectors in biodiversity conservation
- Biodiversity be mainstreamed in the agriculture, forestry, fisheries, pharmaceuticals, tourism...
- Management system on biodiversity conservation is effectively operated

Annex 2.3

MOST IMPORTANT ACTIVITITIES IN THE PROCESS OF UPDATING NBSAPS (FOR COUNTRY CODES SEE ANNEX 2.1)

√ = "important"; √√ = "very important".

Cluster	Component	bd	bt	bn	kh	cn	in	id	jp	kr	la	mv	my	mn	mm	np	pk	ph	sg	sl	th	tl	vn
I. Preparation	1. Rapid stocktaking and review of relevant plans, policies and reports	√		√	√					√			√		√	√	√	√			√	√√	√
	2. Identifying stakeholders; consultations, and awareness	√		√	√√						√		√		√	√	√	√			√	√√	
	3. Supplementary studies (e.g., threats, economic value, etc)	√		√	√	√				√			√		√	√	√	√	√		√√	√	√
II. Setting national priorities and targets	4. Setting national targets, principles, & main priorities of the strategy (national consultations)	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√√	√	√	√√	√√	√	√	√	√
III. Developing the strategy and action plan	5. Developing the strategy and actions to implement the agreed targets though national consultations	√		√								√	√		√	√	√	√	√			√	
	6. Application and implementation of the NBSAP at subnational levels (consultations with subnational authorities)	√		√	√	√						√	√		√	√	√	√	√				
	7. Sectoral integration including mainstreaming into development, poverty reduction and climate change plans (sectoral consultations)	√		√	√√	√	√				√	√	√	√	√	√	√√	√	√	√		√√	√

Cluster	Component	bd	bt	bn	kh	cn	in	id	jp	kr	la	mv	my	mn	mm	np	pk	ph	sg	sl	th	tl	vn
IV. Development of Implementation plans and related	8. Developing a plan for capacity-development for NBSAP implementation	√		√	√			√			√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√				√√	√
	9. Conducting a technology needs assessment alternative: developing a plan for increasing technical capacity.	√									√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√				√	
	10. Developing a communication and outreach strategy for the NBSAP	√		√				√		√		√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√			√√	
	11. Developing a plan for resource mobilization for NBSAP implementation	√		√	√√		√	√		√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√				√√	√
V. Institutional, monitoring, reporting and e√change	12. Establishing/strengthening of national coordination structures	√		√			√	√				√	√		√	√	√	√				√√	√
	13. CHM development.	√		√			√			√		√	√		√	√	√	√				√	
	14. Development of indicators and monitoring approach	√		√	√		√		√	√		√	√		√	√	√	√	√			√	√
	15. Fifth national reports	√		√		√	√			√		√	√		√	√	√	√	√				
VI. Adoption by the government	16. Adoption	√	√	√									√		√	√	√	√				√√	

Annex III

EXAMPLES OF POTENTIAL NATIONAL TARGETS AND/OR ACTIONS RELATED TO THE AICHI BIODIVERSITY TARGETS

Aichi Biodiversity Target	India	China	Indonesia	Sri Lanka
General			By 2009-2020, a comprehensive and coordinated implementation of the entire action plan for national biodiversity management will be accelerated during this phase. One of the most important components is the measurable rehabilitation, conservation and utilization of biodiversity in a balanced manner, with consideration for its conservation principles. By 2020, the implementation of good governance, particularly in the sustainable, responsible and accountable management of biodiversity will hopefully have been developed during this period. Other important components during this phase are the development of effective and just law enforcement, and management practices based on traditional wisdom and local knowledge, with equitable sharing of benefits. (IBSAP 2004-2020)	
Target 1: By 2020, at the latest, people are aware of the values of biodiversity and the steps they can take to conserve and use it sustainably.	During State-level discussions for allocation of plan funds inclusion of awareness of BD values could be insisted. Inclusion of awareness of BD values to be integrated in education curricula through University Grants	Actively conduct environmental awareness-raising, popularize environmental protection knowledge, and enhance public environmental awareness		Implementation of effective awareness programme through mass media and formal and informal education systems for all stakeholders of the society to change the attitudes toward conservation through understanding the value of biodiversity. Inclusion of component of the value of

Aichi Biodiversity Target	India	China	Indonesia	Sri Lanka
	Commission and National Science Academies.	(State Environmental Education and Dissemination Action Planning (2011—2015))		biodiversity to school awareness programmes conducted for other environmental parameters. Review all the relevant curricular of primary, secondary and thesauri education systems and include aspects of value of biodiversity as appropriate. Inclusion of the importance of the value of biodiversity into the religious and cultural presentations which deliver at temples, churches, mosques and respective cultural gatherings. Publish books and documents to understand the importance of value of biodiversity. Inclusion of the aspects of value of biodiversity in to the popular competitions and artistic programmes of music, dancing, drama, etc., in electronic media. Creation of awareness among the private sector that profit and income of all business mostly depends on biodiversity based biological natural capital. Declaration of flagship flora and fauna species as national and provincial identities to create ownership of the community and given special consideration for conservation. Emphasizing the value of trees through implementation of special tree planting programmes with religious and cultural values. ***Proposed Indicators:*** Percentage of people in the society know about value of biodiversity. Rate of decreasing loss of biodiversity. #curricula with biodiversity valuation aspects. #religious/cultural presentation with the aspects of biodiversity values. #books and other documents published with

Aichi Biodiversity Target	India	China	Indonesia	Sri Lanka
				aspects of biodiversity valuation. #popular competitions and artistic programmes with the aspects of values of biodiversity. #awareness programmes for private sector.
Target 2: By 2020, at the latest, biodiversity values have been integrated into national and local development and poverty reduction strategies and planning processes and are being incorporated into national accounting, as appropriate, and reporting systems.	A study on Greening of Accounts has been initiated. Introduction of Green GDP & GSDP(State GDP). Adoption by the Finance Commission as part of the mechanism for devolving funds. Incorporation of BD values in the 12th & 13th Plan. An "Environment Performance Index" (EPI) has been put together to rank states based on environmental performance. Annual Plan allocations (2%) from the 12th plan (2012-2017) to states will be based on EPI ranking. It is proposed to add biodiversity as one of the criterion with 3-4 indicators in the EPI.		By 2020, documentation of best practices in sustainable biodiversity utilization, followed by site-specific applications of those practices by 2020, Programme for developing capacity in biodiversity valuation for local government apparatus practices (IBSAP 2004-2020)	Implementation of "Pricing the Island" project for valuing all biological resources in Sri Lanka. Implementation of a project to include the biodiversity values into National Accounting System. Publish biological values in the Central Bank Report as one of the priority areas. Develop capacity (human) of National Planning and Finance Ministry to address the issues of valuation of biodiversity and integrate into the National Planning procedure. Develop capacity (human) of department of valuation to address the modern techniques of the valuation of Biodiversity. Strengthening the provincial and local government institutions to address the issues of inclusion of biodiversity valuation into the planning process of provincial councils and local governments. Identification of important areas of biodiversity including cultural biodiversity (Palaeobiodiversity), Agro biodiversity etc., and mainstream values of those to income generation. ***Proposed Indicators:*** Percentage of sites/ecosystems valued #project implemented for integrate Biodiversity Valuation to National Accounting System. #capacity development programmes. #local government and provincial institutes developed capacities. #Books.

Aichi Biodiversity Target	India	China	Indonesia	Sri Lanka
Target 3: By 2020, at the latest, incentives, including subsidies, harmful to biodiversity are eliminated, phased out or reformed in order to minimize or avoid negative impacts, and positive incentives for the conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity are developed and applied, consistent and in harmony with the Convention and other relevant international obligations, taking into account national socio-economic conditions.	Compile a list of incentives and subsidies harmful/beneficial to BD. Identify the beneficiaries and revenue loss that accrue to the state and Centre. Indentify and prioritize the incentives and subsidies that can be phased out/continued (with enhancement) with timeframe.	1. Pilot ecological compensation. 2. Subsidies for ecological forests of public interests 3. Conversion of farmlands over 25°slope to forests: subsidies 125 to 90 RMB per Mu (666.67 m^2) for Yangtze River basin and Yellow River basin, respectively 4. Subsidies for whole-year or seasonal prohibition of grazing	Implementation of incentive system for the application of simple and appropriate technology, as well as local wisdom in the management of biodiversity at the community, private sector and government levels (IBSAP 2004-2020) Removal of subsidies for fuel and pesticide. (National Policy) Use environmental payment services mechanism to reduce environmental degradation and people awareness (Midterm Development Plan 2010-2014)	Conduct research programmes/surveys to collect the information on current incentive measurers related to Biodiversity conservation in Sri Lanka. Conduct study to identify the negative impacts of incentives and its magnitudes and identify the alternative policy (fiscal and others) and legal measures to fill the gaps of removal of perverse incentives. Conduct study on positive incentives and promote those incentives in national, provincial and local levels. Identification of positive and negative impacts on control and manage the invasive species. Study and prepare guidelines to avoid the negative impact on Biotechnology. Strengthening the incentive schemes to overcome the damages of biodiversity due to climate change impacts. Establishment of the mechanism to evaluate the impacts on incentives under the political manifesto of ruling government. Mainstreaming BD related incentive scheme into the national planning process. ***Proposed Indicators:*** #positive indicators and negative indictors Effectiveness of implementing incentive scheme #policy and legal instruments for removal of perverse incentives #guidelines to avoid negative impacts #chances to evaluate political manifesto
Target 4: By 2020, at the latest, Governments, business and stakeholders at all levels have taken steps to achieve or	Involve the concerned ministries such as industry, RD, Commerce, Environment, industry Associations, etc., to adopt a SPC strategy. State Forest departments to document MFP production and consumption.	By 2020, build ecological civilization, basically shape industrial structure, growth model and consumption model that save resources and energy and protect eco-environment (Decision of	To achieve the objectives of sustainable management of biodiversity, the existing and potential constraints and opportunities faced by the country must be identified. In this way, the constraints can	Carry out study on identification of economically viable and safe ecological limits of all components of biodiversity. Establishment of component of measures (policy, fiscal policy and legislative) for sustainable production and consumption and inclusion of those measures in to the all

Aichi Biodiversity Target	India	China	Indonesia	Sri Lanka
have implemented plans for sustainable production and consumption and have kept the impacts of use of natural resources well within safe ecological limits.	Adopt in the Working Plan a code to record the SPC of NTFP.	17th Congress of Communist Party of China)	be managed and the opportunities may be developed to the optimum. In the context of these changes, there are four important issues, i.e., economic crisis and reform process, decentralization, globalization, and the political trends and good governance (IBSAP 2004-2020) eco-label and clean development mechanism as tools to control pollution and environmental degradation (midterm development plan 2010-2014)	projects, programmes of conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity. Collect information on traditional culture aspects of sustainable production and consumption related to biodiversity and mainstream those aspects to society in large scale. Create awareness in large scale to change the attitudes of the society that BD related sustainable production and consumption is the only fact to sustain the human in this planet. ***Proposed Indicators:*** #projects, programmes which have a component of sustainable production and consumption #identified ecosystems of economic values #identified ecosystems of safe ecological limits #mainstreamed traditional and cultural aspects of sustainable production and consumptions.
Target 5: By 2020, the rate of loss of all natural habitats, including forests, is at least halved and where feasible brought close to zero, and degradation and fragmentation is significantly reduced	Monitor the targets in the "Green India Mission" report drafted as part of NAPCC to record changes. A task force constituted for all 8 Missions. Wetlands identified as a thrust area in the 12th plan. Special dispensation is under consideration for Himalayan states to enable development without loss of biodiversity.	By 2015, forest coverage rate increased from 20.36% in 2010 to 21.66% in 2015, forest growing stock increased by 600 million m^3 (State Social and Economic Development Planning during 12th Five-Year Plan (2011-2015))	By 2010, the rate of forest loss reduced (IBSAP 2004-2020 and 4th National Report) Reduction in the degradation and loss of biodiversity by 2010. Reduction in the deforestation rate of natural forests to zero level in 2020 (IBSAP 2004-2020) by 2014, improve the quality of conservation area management as well as increase number of ecotourism licensed activities in protected area (midterm development plan 2010-2014)	Review the EIA procedures and give more strong conservation oriented criteria for prescribed projects involving natural habitats. Study the all aspects of encroachments and implement the study recommendations for zero encroachments Selection of suitable degraded lands and reforest to compensate the forest lands which releases for development. ***Proposed Indicators:*** #new criteria for prescribed projects of EIA #declared forest areas #legal provisions #awareness programmes
Target 6: By 2020 all fish and invertebrate stocks and aquatic	Ensure that it is part of the 12th & 13th Plan.	By 2020, aquatic eco-environment will be restored, trend in	Programme for mapping damaged coastal and marine biodiversity, including	Make regulations to protect all threatened invertebrate species. Conduct survey on marine fish stock.

Aichi Biodiversity Target	India	China	Indonesia	Sri Lanka
plants are managed and harvested sustainably, legally and applying ecosystem based approaches, so that overfishing is avoided, recovery plans and measures are in place for all depleted species, fisheries have no significant adverse impacts on threatened species and vulnerable ecosystems and the impacts of fisheries on stocks, species and ecosystems are within safe ecological limits.		degradation of fishery resources and increase of endangered species are basically halted (Action Plan for Cultivation and Conservation of Aquatic Biological Species Resources of China).	seagrass in densely populated areas (IBSAP 2004-2020) Programme for implementing the Jakarta Mandate (under the CBD) on coastal and marine biodiversity conservation, as an integral part of other programme in the IBSAP (IBSAP2004-2020) By 2014, rehab and conserve marine and small island resources through (i) managed 13,5 mill ha marine conservation areas including local marine conservation areas; and (ii) coral reef rehabilitation and conservation programme in 21 districts and 8 cities (Midterm Development Planning 2010-2014)	Conduct survey on indigenous freshwater fish stock. Conduct survey on indigenous aquatic plants and assess for red listing. Make regulation to protect threatened aquatic plants. Promote *ex situ* cultivation for aquatic plants. Establishment of harvesting guidelines for aquarium for fish and aquatic plants. Survey on fishing methods and stop destructive fishing methods. Prepare fishing guidelines for off-show fishing and tank fishing. ***Proposed indicators:*** #amended laws, regulations #check lists, surveys #recovery plans #harvesting and fishing guidelines
Target 7: By 2020 areas under agriculture, aquaculture and forestry are managed sustainably, ensuring conservation of biodiversity.	Ensure preparation of working plans for all forest division. Already prescribed by the 13th finance commission which has allocated Rs 5000 Cr for the sector. Has also set a target that 80% of the WP be prepared by 2012, failing which allocation will not be devolved. Under 12th plan, proposed to conserve gene pool of local varieties of cereals and pulses.	Ensure moderate growth of forests, and enhance the quality and comprehensive benefits of forests (State Planning for Conservation and Utilization of Forest Lands (2010-2020)) By 2020, fishing capacity and fishing yield are equivalent to the fishery resource carrying capacity (Action Plan for Cultivation and Conservation of Aquatic Biological Species Resources of China).	Programme to develop and disseminate local and indigenous knowledge in sustainable agriculture.(IBSAP2004-2020) Agriculture productivity is increased seed diversity, there is a more equitable agricultural policy for the farmers, and there are seed conservation efforts (IBSAP2004-2020)	Implementation of the project of mainstreaming under utilized crops and their nutrients through conservation of agrobiodiversity. Assess and conserve the pollinators and soil microorganism communities for sustainable agricultural productivity. Implementation of the project of adaptation of climate change impacts on agrobiodiversity through livelihood development. Develop legal instruments or amend existing laws to protect the indigenous crops from contamination of GMOs. ***Proposed Indicators:*** #mainstreamed underutilized crops #threatened pollinators

Aichi Biodiversity Target	India	China	Indonesia	Sri Lanka
				#soil microorganism communities per sq. meter of cultivated soils #new adaptation measures used
Target 8: By 2020, pollution, including from excess nutrients, has been brought to levels that are not detrimental to ecosystem function and biodiversity.	Reclamation/restoration/conservation of wetland /lakes/ ponds is a thrust area of the 12th plan. Special allocation for river cleaning and water bodies restoration. Ensure implementation of the NAAQS and Water quality standards by the state. Is also a part of the EPI.	By 2015, total discharge of main pollutants are reduced significantly, discharge of chemical oxygen demand and SO_2 reduced by 8%, discharge of ammonia nitrogen and nitrogen dioxide reduced by 10% (State Social and Economic Development Planning during Twelfth Five-Year Plan (2011-2015))	By 2020, identification of pollution level in marine and coastal ecosystems, particularly in densely populated and industrial areas, and recommendations for damage prevention and rehabilitation targets, by 2020. Programme for preventing marine ecosystems pollution due to disposal of tailing from mining activities, either directly into the sea or through local river networks Submarine tailing disposal technology is prohibited in 2004; revocation mining licenses of companies that disposed of its waste directly to local river system at the end of 2003, and that currently applies STD, by 2004 (IBSAP 2004-2020) Programme for pollution control in marine as well as terrestrial areas (Midterm Development Planning 2010-2014)	Carry out a study with broader spectrum of use of excessive agrochemicals and areas their accumulation. Establishment of the national survey on water quality with special reference to plant nutrients. Rehabilitation of the ecosystems which are contaminated through high levels of nutrients. Holding of country level awareness programmes for reduction of usage of chemical fertilizers. Introduction of economic instruments to promote organic agriculture and reduce the usage of chemical fertilizers. Further studies of soils of Sri Lanka and amend the fertilizer recommendations to reduced nutrients levels of effluents. ***Proposed indicators:*** Nutrients levels of surface and ground water Decreasing amounts of application of chemical fertilizers #entities (Farms) or extents organic agriculture
Target 9: By 2020, invasive alien species and pathways are identified and prioritized, priority species are controlled or eradicated, and measures are in place to manage pathways to prevent their			Formulation and implementation of policies to address and prevent invasive species that threaten local biodiversity. Formulation and implementation of policies to protect genetic resources and local/customary knowledge of communities (IBSAP 2004-2020).	Awareness creation programmes for general public and community. Project implemented to management of aquatic invasive species. Introduction of bio control agents for troublesome invasive species. Development of risk assessment procedure/early warning systems/black lists and potential lists of invasive flora and

Aichi Biodiversity Target	India	China	Indonesia	Sri Lanka
introduction and establishment.			Programme for implementing the Jakarta Mandate (under the CBD) on coastal and marine biodiversity conservation, as an integral part of other programme in the IBSAP (IBSAP2004-2020) The Jakarta Mandate has five programme components: • Integrated marine and coastal area management. • Marine and coastal living resources. • Marine and coastal protected areas. • Mariculture. • Alien species and genotypes.	fauna. Prepare and finalize national lists of invasive flora and fauna and update when necessary. Draft an Act on control and management of invasive species Studies carry out socio-economic dimensions of invasive species Study the economic impacts of aquatic invasive species Pilot studies at identified locations on control and management of IAS and restoration of areas Strengthen the capacity of government custodian organizations, private sector and NGO organizations relevant to the issue for better coordination and implementation of management of invasive species. Set up proper institutional coordination mechanism to tackle the issues of IAS Conduct researches on identified issues/recommendations of IAS –PPG (gaps are already identified on research conducted on IAS in Sri Lanka) Strengthen a separate unit at the BDS to conduct all activities of CBD relevant IAS and implement the Act on IAS. Conduct surveys on native animals (monkeys, etc.) with invasive behaviour and take action to stop the upward trends of animal human conflicts. ***Proposed indicators:*** Prioritize list of invasive species #species management plans and cases Control and manage the freshwater invasive species.
Target 10: By 2015, the multiple anthropogenic pressures on coral	Facilitate preparation of maps on 1:10,000 and 1:4,000 for critical areas identified by the states to reduce anthropogenic pressures on	By 2015, the discharge of CO_2 per unit of GDP reduced by 17% (State Social and Economic Development	Conduct integrated coastal management programme, established and implement laws and regulation (Laws	Update the status of national coral reefs with filling the gaps in existing information by surveys Preparation of Coral reef identification

Aichi Biodiversity Target	India	China	Indonesia	Sri Lanka
reefs, and other vulnerable ecosystems impacted by climate change or ocean acidification are minimized, so as to maintain their integrity and functioning.	vulnerable ecosystems. Allocation for the J.L.Nehru Urban Renewal Mission (JNNURM) has been increased considerably to arrest sewage disposal and minimise ocean acidification.	Planning during Twelfth Five-Year Plan (2011-2015)).	No. 27/2007 and Presidential Decree No. 78/2005), develop inter-district coordination on marine programmes as well as transboundary programmes (CTI, Sulu Sulawesi, etc), (Midterm Development Planning 2010-2014)	manual and hand of Coral Reef of Sri Lanka. Carry out a study to identify the impacts of climate change, invasiveness and human interference (visitation etc) on coral reef. Implementation of coral reef restoration programme with replanting, stop pollution, control visitation etc. Establishment of interagency committee for coral reef monitoring programme. Conduct research programmes on adaptation of mangrove species Conduct research programmes on the impact of climate change and ocean acidification on marine flora (sea grass, marine algae, etc) ***Proposed indicators:*** Extent of marine protected areas Extent of rehabilitate coastal areas Extent of replanting coral areas #surveys, research programmes #coral reef related publications, studies Extent of bleach reef area #coral reef restoration programmes #incidence on reef damage (by another species)
Target 11: By 2020, at least 17 per cent of terrestrial and inland water, and 10 per cent of coastal and marine areas, especially areas of particular importance for biodiversity and ecosystem services, are conserved through effectively and equitably managed, ecologically		By 2015, percent of terrestrial nature reserves in total terrestrial territory is around 15%, by 2020, basically shape a nature reserve system, ecological function of national nature reserves remains stable, main protection targets are protected effectively (NBSAP). Forest parks and Scenic sites Fishing ban policy from June	Protected Forest Area is already above 17% (4th National Report) By 2014, rehab and conserve marine and small island resources through (i) managed 13,5 mill ha marine conservation areas including local marine conservation areas; and (ii) coral reef rehabilitation and conservation programme in 21 district and 8 cities (Midterm Development	Further identification of ecologically and economically important representative ecosystem and declare for conservation. Establishment of micro biodiversity hotspots and connected among those with natural or manmade corridors. Extending the terrestrial and inland water protected area up to 30 percent including proposed biodiversity micro hotspots network. Increase the area of marine protection up to 10 percent with marine components of all existing sea bounded terrestrial protected areas.

Aichi Biodiversity Target	India	China	Indonesia	Sri Lanka
representative and well connected systems of protected areas and other effective area-based conservation measures, and integrated into the wider landscape and seascapes.		to September in all China marine waters	Planning 2010-2014)	Declare or upgrade the category of protected area of all important marine areas which are not connected to sea bounded PAs. Completion of the declaration of already identified important forest area as protected areas. Completion of boundary survey and demarcation of balance protected areas. ***Proposed indicators:*** Percentage of total area of PAs Percentage of total area of marine PAs #PAs with sea and terrestrial components. #connected fragmented ecosystems
Target 12: By 2020 the extinction of known threatened species has been prevented and their conservation status, particularly of those most in decline, has been improved and sustained.		By 2015, 80 per cent of wild, endangered species with small populations inadequately conserved in-situ will be protected through adequate *ex-situ* conservation; by 2020, biodiversity loss is basically curbed (NBSAP). By 2020, populations of most rare and endangered species are restored and increased, the status of threatened species are improved (Planning for Conservation and Utilization of Biological Species Resources of China)	Improvement in the development of up to date and accurate database on the area of biodiversity-rich agro-ecosystems, together with local cultivation techniques, with the objective to protect such areas, through the formulation. Implementation of effective laws and regulations as well as implementation of national biodiversity census during to be used as a foundation for planning sustainable management of biodiversity for the period of 2009-2020 (IBSAP 2004-2020)	Assesses the conservation status of all indigenous wild species every 4 years and publish national red data book. Implementation of species recovery action plans for most localized and threatened species. Review the protected area network and declare new areas specially to protect the area of endemic, localized and highly threatened species. Completion of red listing process for year – 2013 and take measurers for threatened species for protection and amend the existing law to protect those species. Preparation of check lists for all invertebrate species and assess for red listing. Update the Knowledge plant list of Sri Lanka and publish. Preparation of Known animal list of Sri Lanka. Preparation/updating inventory of fungi in Sri Lanka and establishment of a National data base. Preparation/updating inventory of bacteria of Sri Lanka and establishment of a National database.

Aichi Biodiversity Target	India	China	Indonesia	Sri Lanka
				Establishment of Threatened Plant Gardens specially for forest species Implementation of recovery plans for highly threatened endemic freshwater fish and aquatic plants. Implementation of recovery plans for highly threatened marine fish ***Proposed Indicators:*** #species assessed #species recovery action plans implemented #additional areas (Ha.) included in to protected areas only for recovery of most threatened, localized and endemic species. #Completion of Known Plant List Completion of Known Animal List #Inventories for Microorganisms #National Databases #Threatened plan gardens. #ex-situ cultivation sites Time period for red-listing process
Target 13: By 2020, the genetic diversity of cultivated plants and farmed and domesticated animals and of wild relatives, including other socio-economically as well as culturally valuable species, is maintained, and strategies have been developed and implemented for minimizing genetic erosion and safeguarding their genetic diversity.		By 2020, biodiversity loss is basically curbed, a nature reserve system is basically shaped, and main protection targets are protected effectively (NBSAP).	By 2015, recovery of fish stocks and other marine biota in the already depleted areas The issuance and implementation of sustainable timber harvesting, through environmentally friendly methods, and adapted to the carrying capacity of the local ecosystem. Formulation and implementation of policies to protect genetic resources and local/ customary knowledge of communities (IBSAP 2004-2020)	Establishment of Incentive schemes for on farm conservation of indigenous agro biodiversity Promotion of ex situ cultivation of medicinal plants Establishment of effective monitoring system to monitor the implementation of the outcomes of the conservation of crop wild relatives and wild domesticated animal breeds projects. Implementation of on-farm conservation for traditional crop varieties and land races Improvement of ex-situ facilities of animal genetic resources Develop proper marketing channels for traditional agricultural crops Promote all positive characters and advantages of indigenous cultivated plants

Aichi Biodiversity Target	India	China	Indonesia	Sri Lanka
				and domesticated animals. Promotion of *ex situ* conservation facilities for all wild relatives, neglected and underutilized indigenous crops. Establishment of field genebanks for all important (sociologically, culturally, economically) indigenous crops. ***Proposed indicators:*** #species based on farm conservation #*ex-situ* centres for domesticated farm animals #monitoring programmes for crop wild relatives #marketing channels for traditional crops #*ex-situ* facilities #gene banks #threatened crop wild relatives #threatened domesticated animal breeds in wild
Target 14: By 2020, ecosystems that provide essential services, including services related to water, and contribute to health, livelihoods and well-being, are restored and safeguarded, taking into account the needs of women, indigenous and local communities, and the poor and vulnerable.	States have been asked to ensure strengthening the implementation of PESA, and FRA so as to safeguard ecosystem services for ensuring livelihood security for forests and forests-fringe dwellers. A monitoring mechanism has also been put in place.	By 2020, the ecological function of national nature reserves remains stable (NBSAP) Continue to implement forest conservation programmes	Improve the ability of communities in conducting sustainable and equitable management of biodiversity based on local knowledge and wisdom, supported by an easy access to accurate data and information on the functions and potentials of biodiversity, their distribution and abundance, etc., and by equitable and profitable trade and pricing system (IBSAP 2004-2020) Improvement in the capacity of government and communities, at the national and regional level, to sustainably use biodiversity, but ensuring conservation priorities. Better coordination in the	Documentation and mainstreaming of ecosystem services and values of forests and wetlands. Promotion and mainstreaming of underutilized food crops especially for food nutrition. Carry out survey on and mapping and reforestation of degraded watersheds which is important for drinking water supply. Prepare special management plans for indigenous people dwelling PAs to facilitate their livelihood. Establishment of biodiversity banks with private sector **Proposed Indicators** #ecosystems assess #Incentive schemes #*ex-situ* cultivations #mainstreamed underutilized crops

Aichi Biodiversity Target	India	China	Indonesia	Sri Lanka
			implementation of CBD between government and nongovernment agencies, and improved coordination in the implementation of various other international conventions such as CITES and Ramsar	#surveys Extent of reforested areas #special management plans #banks
Target 15: By 2020, ecosystem resilience and the contribution of biodiversity to carbon stocks has been enhanced, through conservation and restoration, including restoration of at least 15 per cent of degraded ecosystems, thereby contributing to climate change mitigation and adaptation and to combating desertification.	A monitoring matrix for eight national missions under the NAPCC prepared. PC to monitor all the targets set by the missions and enable implementation. Rs 200 Cr allocated. The Green India mission has set the following targets:- Increase in afforestation of 5 per cent Plantation on 5 million Ha. of degraded forests and improve quality of forest cover by another 5 million Ha.	By 2015, 14 programmes on ecological conservation and restoration are implemented (State Social and Economic Development Planning during Twelfth Five-Year Plan (2011-2015).	Mainstream biodiversity roles in carbon stock in the development of national strategic for REED+ (draft October 2010) and the next midterm development planning for 2015-2019.	Rehabilitation of already degraded areas important for connecting already fragmented ecosystems. Strengthened the legal provisions and increase awareness creation to stop the harvesting of coral reef for lime production. Survey on important ecosystems and Identification of ecosystems with poor ecosystem health and restore to upgrade ecosystem resilience. Updating the information on ecosystem carbon stocks and prevent loss of carbon stocks by forest fire and other anthropogenic factors and restore the degraded ecosystems to enhance the carbon stocks Declaration of new environmental protection areas. Development of reforestation project with indigenous forest species especially for degraded hilltops. Study and develop necessary plant corridors for forest species migration as an adaptation to the impact of climate change. Development or enrichment of home garden system to enhance carbon stocks Implementation of mangrove and river bank restoration and conservation projects Holding National Tree Planting campaigns with maximum #plants and effective maintenance. **Proposed Indicators**

Aichi Biodiversity Target	India	China	Indonesia	Sri Lanka
				#EPAs declared Extent of mangrove restorations No. of improved home garden units in each Divisional Secretariat #trees/plants for national tree planting campaigns #surveys #restored degraded ecosystems
Target 16: By 2015, the Nagoya Protocol on Access to Genetic Resources and the Fair and Equitable Sharing of Benefits Arising from their Utilization is in force and operational, consistent with national legislation.	Enable Cabinet Note Approval.	By 2015, a system on access to and benefit sharing of genetic resources is preliminarily established (NBSAP)	Responded in next updated the NBSAP	Translation of Nagoya Protocol on Access to Genetic Resources and Fair and Equitable Sharing of Benefits Arising from their Utilization in to the local language (Sinhala and Tamil) and make aware of all levels of civil society. Establishment of database on patents worldwide on biological and genetic resources and Clearing-House Mechanism at national and provincial levels. Obtaining relevant approvals and sign and ratified the Nagoya Protocol on access to Genetic Resources and Fair and Equitable Sharing of Benefits Creation of awareness countrywide for the benefit of implementation of protocol Enactment of necessary legislation or amend existing legislation for smooth implementation of the protocol Preparation of guidelines, handbook for all stakeholder groups of utilization of genetic resources including researches with scientific, technical, technological, economic, social, cultural legal and ethical considerations/aspects. Promote bio-prospecting both animal and plant genetic resources with application of traditional knowledge. Strengthened the institutional capacities and capabilities including establishment of high powered National Biodiversity Institute for coordination, execution and monitoring and evaluation of all national and

Aichi Biodiversity Target	India	China	Indonesia	Sri Lanka
				international levels activities and especially for sustainable utilization of indigenous genetic resources and bio-prospecting. ***Proposed indicators:*** #languages that translated protocol and copies of book /languages #database and CHM Time period for ratification #participants for awareness workshops #related legislation/amendments and regulations #handbooks/guidelines #fauna/flora which involved bio-prospecting. Time period for establishing new institute
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	PC would facilitate and contribute towards updating of NBSAP.	The updated NBSAP was promulgated in 2010, and is being implemented with mobilized resources.	Had been implemented in the 2nd NBSAP	Inclusion of the requirement of the updating NBS&SAP with appropriate time period in to the national policy on biodiversity conservation and sustainable use and the relevant legal instruments. Establishment of respective coordinating mechanisms including coordination for grass-root level stakeholder of the civil society and networks (impact, protection and use) of government agencies and private sector for preparation, updating and implementation of Biodiversity strategy and action plan. Institutionalization of the preparation and updating Biodiversity Action Plan and Strategy Review National Biodiversity policy and other related policies to include the importance of preparation and updating Biodiversity Action Plan and Strategy. Prepare expert database like project management package with all annual physical and financial targets extracted from 5 year NBS&AP and electronically revise the targets and respective inputs annually for cost effective and timely implementation.

Aichi Biodiversity Target	India	China	Indonesia	Sri Lanka
				Proposed Indicators: #policy instruments #coordinating mechanisms #institutionalized activities #expert database
Target 18: By 2020, the traditional knowledge, innovations and practices of indigenous and local communities relevant for the conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity, and their customary use of biological resources, are respected, subject to national legislation and relevant international obligations, and fully integrated and reflected in the implementation of the Convention with the full and effective participation of indigenous and local communities, at all relevant levels	Enable implementation of BDA, FRA and PESA 2006 and modification of working plan code to incorporate forest dwellers rights in the working plan.	By 2020, further improve the system of traditional knowledge inventory and property protection (Planning for Conservation and Utilization of Biological Species Resources of China),	Objective 2: To strengthen resources for supporting the development of science, technology and the application of local wisdom for the conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity (IBSAP 2004-2020)	Cabinet of Ministers. Formulation of concurrent national legislation to protect the traditional knowledge, respect their customary use of biological resources of traditional people and poster traditional people or amend existing legislation to achieve above targets. Establishment of traditional people's forum and built capacity to make contribution for the national level decision-making process on conservation and sustainable use of biological diversity. Improve the defensive documentation of traditional knowledge as government property. Establishment of language laboratories to protect knowledge related local languages. Preparation of biodiversity registers including knowledge aspects for each villages which hold important traditional knowledge Holding of annual award ceremony to appreciate traditional knowledge holders. Implementation of the programmes to recollect all documents including owl leaf which were looted by foreign nations and deposited at museums. ***Proposed indicators:*** Time period of policy finalization #new concurrent legislation or #amend legislation. #documented traditional knowledge units #language laboratories. #Biodiversity registers

Aichi Biodiversity Target	India	China	Indonesia	Sri Lanka
				#Traditional people forums #Annual ceremonies. #recollect documents
Target 19: By 2020, knowledge, the science base and technologies relating to biodiversity, its values, functioning, status and trends, and the consequences of its loss, are improved, widely shared and transferred, and applied.	Approach paper to the 12th plan has laid emphasis on S&T for inputs towards biodiversity and its evaluation.	By 2020, the percent of R&D in total GDP is more than 2.5%, and the contribution of science and technology is larger than 60% (State Middle and Long-term Planning for Science and Technology Development (2006-2020))	Programme for developing biodiversity science and technology curriculum for elementary and secondary schools, and for vocational trainings. Increased applied researches on sustainable management of biodiversity, particularly, but not limited to, its sustainable use for medicine, cosmetics, and agriculture products, through the development of an appropriate and effective incentive system. Dissemination of information, easy access to information sources, and application of simple and appropriate technology for a sustainable and balanced management of biodiversity, at the levels of communities, the private sector; and the government at the local, regional, and national levels (IBSAP 2010-2014)	Establishment National level Network including Ministries of Technology and Research and Education and all research institutes to improve the Knowledge management and knowledge sharing. Establishment of National Database on biological knowledge storage and sharing. National biodiversity, Biosafety and ABS CHMs developed and improved Mainstreaming CEPA for national knowledge management system of Biodiversity Holding national research based symposiums of biodiversity related subject areas as much as possible, and document all new knowledge and shared. Holding regular forums with researchers and research findings implementation sectors (private sector – agriculture, forestry, fisheries, industries etc) to improve the finding application. Establishment of centre of excellent to facilitate the obtaining of patent rights of the research findings**.** ***Proposed Indicators:*** Number of national biodiversity information networks Number of technical publications (any categories) Mainstreaming efforts with national technical educations (curriculum additions) #Networks #Database #Symposiums #research findings sharing forums #Knowledge related centres of excellence.

Aichi Biodiversity Target	India	China	Indonesia	Sri Lanka
Target 20: By 2020, at the latest, the mobilization of financial resources for effectively implementing the Strategic Plan 2011-2020 from all sources and in accordance with the consolidated and agreed process in the Strategy for Resource Mobilization should increase substantially from the current levels. This target will be subject to changes contingent to resources needs assessments to be developed and reported by Parties.	Ensure allocation of resources.	Ensuring measures of NBSAP: enlarge financial input from all levels of fiscal budget into capacity building, basic research and ecological compensation for biodiversity conservation.	Integration of IBSAP implementation with the development planning programmes	Establishment of trust funds for major sectors of biodiversity (forestry, wildlife etc) and maintain as self sufficient entities with the covering of all cost from the generation of sector income. Develop private sector partnership for major biodiversity sectors through effective bio-prospecting. Develop innovative initiatives for income generation from the applying ecosystem services of major sectors of biodiversity. Budget provision from domestic funds for biodiversity activities. Establishment of national bio-insurance scheme to meet the risk and uncertainty of bio-business Establishment of bio-banking system to promote the sustainable use of biodiversity. Create awareness among business community regarding the importance of natural biological capital (biodiversity) for sustainability of any business and promote partnership for sustainable use of biodiversity. Prepare incentive scheme to promote private sector partnership for bio-prospecting. Establish separate unit in National Focal point to the Convention/external resources department to hunting all available foreign grant funds from multilateral and by-lateral sources and soft loans for conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity. ***Proposed Indicators:*** #Trust funds #Partnerships for bio-prospecting #Bio-insurance schemes #Bio-banks #Awareness programmes #hunting funds

Annex IV **Purpose /level**	**Relative existing and planned funding levels from various sources:**				**Examples of actions needed to achieve increase**
	Domestic budget for biodiversity	**Domestic budget for other sectors**	**ODA (including GEF)**	**Innovative Funding mechanisms**	
Enabling activities – Facilitating biodiversity planning & implementation (e.g., NBSAPs, priority area analysis; assessments)	(existing) $		$		Application to GEF
	(planned) $		$$		
Core Biodiversity Where main purpose of the activity is to protect biodiversity (protected areas, regulation)	(existing) $$		$	$	Promote understanding of tourism value of protected areas Pre-budget workshops and discussions Donors fora and roundtables Application to GEF
	(planned) $$$	$	$$	$$	
Mainstreaming: Integrating biodiversity into sectors	(existing) $	$	$	$	Awareness-raising, education and sensitization Pre-budget workshops and discussions Establish biodiversity trust fund Updating laws and regulations Integrate biodiversity into development and poverty reduction strategies and into local government planning Promote PES
	(planned) $	$$$$	$	$$$	
Ecosystem-based adaptation and mitigation etc	(existing)	$	$	$	Updating laws and regulations Integrate biodiversity into climate change adaptation and mitigation strategies Engage in REDD+ Promote PES
	(planned)	$$$$$	$	$$$$$	
"Green economy" (sustainable consumption and production)	(existing)	$?	$?	$?	Wider use of strategic and integrated environmental assessments Updating laws and regulations
	(planned)	$$$?	$?	$$$?	

Annex V

RESULTS OF THE EXERCISES ON VALUATION AND INCENTIVE MEASURES

AICHI TARGET 2

"By 2020, at the latest, biodiversity values have been integrated into national and local development and poverty reduction strategies and planning processes and are being incorporated into national accounting, as appropriate, and reporting systems."

Participants were tasked to develop an ambitious while realistic 'mock' national target which 'translates' Aichi target 2 into a revised National Biodiversity Strategy and Action Plan, and identify associated activities and timelines.

Suggested sub-targets and timelines:

1. By 2015 the value of biodiversity is identified and all stakeholders are made aware of the value of biodiversity:

    a) Conduct valuation study of the goods and services provided by the national biodiversity

    b) Develop and implement capacity-building and capacity development programme

2. By 2020 biodiversity values are incorporated in to all national plans:

    a) Develop an effective coordination mechanism.

    b) Assess the gaps in the existing national plans

    c) Integrate the value of biodiversity into all national and sectoral and subnational plans

    d) Establish M&E of the integration of biodiversity values into the national plans

3. By 2025 biodiversity values are incorporated into national accounts to contribute poverty reduction:

    a) Introduce safeguard mechanisms and approaches to all forms of livelihoods

    b) Introduce sustainable livelihood options in to national, subnational, indigenous and local level

Suggested targets for sector-specific activities (here: forestry as an example):

Ecosystem Services from Forest Ecosystem

- Target for 2020: Awareness raised of relevant development policy makers on the value of ecosystems services and possible use of valuation methods for planning and poverty reduction;
- By 2015: Start a pilot valuation project for forest ecosystems (will need to build capacity-building for relevant offices (i.e., statistics).
- By 2020: Planning and Sectoral Offices adopt TEEB guidelines.

(Note: to do it properly and based on experience of developed countries such as Japan & US)

Suggested timeline: Gantt chart:

2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
CAPACITY -BUILDING					
National/Local					
STRENGTHEN STATISTICAL OFFICE					
	National				
DEVELOP GUIDE					
Lines for data collection					
	DATA COLLECTION				
	DATA ANALYSIS				
		ENDORSE POLICY			
			INTEGRATE EIA/SEA/ SPAT.		
			INTEGRATE INTO NAT. DEVELOPMENT		
				INTEGRATE SECTORAL PLANS	

AICHI TARGET 3

"By 2020, at the latest, incentives, including subsidies, harmful to biodiversity are eliminated, phased out or reformed in order to minimize or avoid negative impacts, and positive incentives for the conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity are developed and applied, consistent and in harmony with the Convention and other relevant international obligations, taking into account national socio economic conditions."

Participants were tasked to work on four lead questions.

Harmful incentives

1. Identify possible obvious candidates for prioritized removal, phase-out or reform, for instance policies and/or programmes suspected to be both environmentally harmful and cost-ineffective.

- Policies leading to the over consumption or wastage of water;
- Fishery subsidies (e.g., for fuel, nets and boats) that result in over fishing; for instance subsidies for fish nets which damage corals;
- Traditional agricultural practices (e.g., slash and burn systems) which do not factor in the value of land into conversion, thus providing for instance incentives for forest conversion;
- Various harmful incentives may also result from development policies such as: food security programmes; community/rural infrastructure development programme (road, irrigation, electricity); as well as from reforestation programmes and programmes for the promotion of renewable energy.

2. How could stakeholder interests/concerns be addressed?

- Provide correct information both parties to politicians and the general public; ensure transparency, both on the damage resulting for instance from certain subsidies as well as on the planned reforms (so that stakeholders can adjust more easily);
- Consult with all relevant stakeholders, including relevant line ministries;
- Design and implement a compensatory system for the poor that are negatively affected by reform policies, address possible incentives for abuse during the design process;
- The use of disincentives could be combined with such a pro-poor system; for instance, a water tax could be combined with a pro-poor redistribution of the tax receipts;
- Introduction of targeted positive incentive measures; for instance, fish nets could be subsidized which are friendly for turtles; forest credits could work against incentives for forest clearing; etc.

Positive incentive measures:

3. How could existing positive incentive measures be improved?

- In general, relevant budget lines in government budgets need to be increased;
- Further strengthen community management of natural resources: give ownership of land to communities - people have higher incentives to protect their own area;
- Compensatory funds for wildlife damage;
- Design carbon credit programmes so that they reward conservation of old-growth forests;
- Subsidies for sustainable aquaculture in order to reduce fish demand;
- Tax reductions for eco-green labelled products from Good Agriculture Practices (GAP)

- Interest-subsidized loans for instance for eco-products;

4. Where in particular do you see a need to introduce new incentive programmes?

- Correcting/aligning incentives in intensive agricultural systems, in order to address (e.g., short rotation periods) support for the conversion to organic farming;
- For the development and introduction of green technologies;
- For the more systematic application of EIA, SEA;
- For research.

Appendix I

ORGANIZATION OF WORK: DETAILED TIMETABLE

Monday 9 May		**Item**
8.30 a.m. – 9.30 a.m.	**1**	**Opening of the workshop** Opening Statements: China MEP, Shaanxi Province, Secretariat CBD, Representative of Japan, Chanba district of Xi'an City, (simultaneous interpretation provided by China)
9.30 a.m.- 10.15 a.m.		*Coffee or tea break (Group picture before the break)*
10.15 a.m. - noon	**2**	**Review of the findings of the GBO-3 and overview of the Aichi-Nagoya outcomes** Self-introductions of Participants/Expectations from the workshop Presentation on GBO 3 and Overview of the Nagoya Outcomes (SCBD) Questions & Answers Presentation on Japan Biodiversity Outlook (Japan) Presentation on ASEAN Biodiversity Outlook (ACB) Questions & Answers Synergistic implementation of biodiversity-related Conventions (UNEP)
noon - 1 p.m.		*Lunch*
1.30 p.m. -3 p.m.	**3**	**Review and updating of NBSAPs – lessons learned and next steps** Country presentations on national reviews of NBSAPs (Malaysia, Pakistan, Sri Lanka) Group exercises on achievements and challenges in development and implementation of NBSAPs Reporting of group discussion results
3 p.m. – 3.30 p.m.		*Coffee or tea break*
3.30 p.m. - 5.30 p.m.	**3**	**Review and updating of NBSAPs – lessons learned and next steps (cont'd)** Experience and lessons from the first generation of NBSAPs; finding from the UNU assessment and the first round of workshops (SCBD)
6 p.m. – 8 p.m.		*Reception, courtesy of the Ministry of Environmental Protection of China*
Tuesday 10 May		
8.30 a.m. – 10.30 a.m.	**3&4**	**Recap of 9 May discussions** Guidance on development, updating and implementation of NBSAPs (NBSAP training modules 1 & 2) (SCBD) **Review and updating of NBSAPs – lessons learned and next steps** Country presentations on updating NBSAPs (China, Japan, India), with Q & A
10.30 a.m. – 11 a.m.		*Coffee or tea break*
11 a.m. – 12.30 p.m.	**4& 5**	**Setting national and regional targets in the framework of the Aichi Biodiversity Targets** Examine Goal A, target 2: Individual country exercises: examining entry points for integrating biodiversity into national planning processes Access to funds for updating NBSAPs (UNDP/UNEP), with Q & A
12.30 p.m. –		*Lunch*

1.30 p.m.		
1.30 p.m. -3 p.m.	**4& 5**	**Setting national and regional targets in the framework of the Aichi Biodiversity Targets** **Integrating biodiversity into relevant national and local planning processes** Presentation by RARE International on social marketing to involve communities in addressing environmental problems (related to Targets1 & 4) Biodiversity conservation and poverty alleviation (A case of Chifeng, Inner Mongolia of China) Strategic environment assessment (Indonesia) National experiences and lessons learned in mainstreaming biodiversity (Cambodia, the Philippines) Mainstreaming at the local level in the Philippines (UNDP) Questions & Answers
3 p.m. – 3.30 p.m.		*Coffee or tea break*
3.30 p.m. -5 p.m.	**4**	**Setting national and regional targets in the framework of the Aichi Biodiversity Targets** Existing national targets for the post-2010 period (China) National targets and NBSAP (module 4) (SCBD) Questions & Answers **Setting national and regional targets in the framework of the Aichi Biodiversity Targets (cont'd)** Examine Goal B Group exercises on identifying priorities to address major threats to major ecosystems
Wednesday 11 May		
8.30 a.m.- 10 a.m.	**5**	**Recap of 10 May** **Stakeholder engagement and strategic communication** A presentation by IUCN ECE Group exercises on stakeholder engagement and strategic communication
10 a.m. – 10.30 a.m.		*Coffee or tea break*
10.30 a.m.- 12.30 p.m.	**4**	**Setting national and regional targets in the framework of the Aichi Biodiversity Targets (cont'd)** Examine Goal C Group exercise: National targets in relation to Aichi target 11. Transboundary protected areas NEASPEC (UN ESCPA), with Q & A
1230 - 1330		*Lunch*
1.30 p.m. – 3 p.m.	**4**	**Setting national and regional targets in the framework of the Aichi Biodiversity Targets (cont'd)** International Partnerships on Satoyama Initiatives (UNU IAS Satoyama Initiative) Examine Goal D Group Exercises on identifying ecosystem services important for the country and what can be done to maintain these ecosystem services The Nagoya Protocol on Access and Benefit Sharing (SCBD)
3 p.m. – 3.30 p.m.		*Coffee or tea break*
3.30 p.m. – 5 p.m.	**9**	**Monitoring of implementation of the Strategic Plan and NBSAP** A presentation by Birdlife Asia**,** with Q & A Indicator development (UNEP-WCMC), with Q & A

Thursday 12 May		
8 a.m. – 5 p.m.		**Field visits to Chanba Eco-Zone and Niubeiliang Protected Areas**
Friday 13 May		
8.30 a.m. – 10 a.m.	**8**	**Recap of 11 May and the field trip** **Development of local biodiversity strategies and action plans** A Presentation by SCBD (training module 8) **Strengthening scientific and technical cooperation in the region** Regional and national centres of excellence to support scientific and technical cooperation (presentation, Dr. Hong-Yul SEO, National Institute of Biological Resources in Korea) Use of national and regional CHM as tool of scientific and technical cooperation (ACB)
10 a.m. – 10.30 a.m.		*Coffee or tea break*
10.30 a.m. – 12.30 p.m.	**7**	**Strengthening scientific and technical cooperation in the region (cont'd)** Experiences and lessons from ASEAN cooperation (ASEAN Centre for Biodiversity) Presentation on South-South Cooperation (SCBD) Plenary discussion: ways and means to promote scientific and technical cooperation in the region **Resource Mobilization for NBSAP Implementation** Introduction to Module 6 (SCBD/UNDP/UNEP) Group exercises and plenary discussion: identifying opportunities for funding, including innovative funding mechanisms
12.30 p.m. – 1.30 p.m.		*Lunch*
1.30 p.m.– 3 p.m.	**7 &9**	**Resource Mobilization for NBSAP Implementation** (cont'd) Panel discussions on entry points for integrating biodiversity into planning processes **Synthesis and conclusions of the first part of the workshop** Synthesis of the first part of the workshop
3 p.m. – 3.30 p.m		*Coffee or tea break*
3.30 p.m. – 5 p.m.	**9**	**Synthesis and conclusions of the first part of the workshop (cont'd)** Conclusions of the workshop
Saturday 14 May		
8.25 a.m. – 10.25 a.m.		**Participation in the International Forum on Cities and Biodiversity**
10.25 a.m. – 2 p.m.		**Cultural visit to Historic site of the Terracotta Warriors**
2 p.m. – 2.50 p.m.		*Lunch*
2.50 p.m. onwards		**Visit to the International Horticultural Exposition**
Sunday 15 May		
8.30 a.m. –	**10**	**Valuation and incentive measures as a tool for mainstreaming**

10 a.m.		Overview of objectives and programme (Mr. Markus LEHMANN, SCBD) An introduction into the economics of ecosystems and biodiversity (presentation, Ms. Haripriya GUNDIMEDA, TEEB and IITB) General discussion

10 a.m. – 10.30 a.m.		*Coffee or tea break*
10.30 a.m. – 12.30 p.m.	**10**	**Valuation and incentive measures as a tool for mainstreaming (cont'd)** The valuation of ecosystem services and biodiversity: opportunities, limitations and challenges (presentation, Markus LEHMANN, SCBD, and Andrew SEIDL, IUCN) Impacts of land use management on ecosystem services and their regulations: a case study in Hainan Island, China (presentation Mr. Zheng Hua, Chinese Academy of Sciences) Discussion
12.30 p.m. – 1.30 p.m.		*Lunch*
1.30 p.m.– 2.30 p.m.	**10**	**Valuation and incentive measures as a tool for mainstreaming (cont'd)** The Chinese Integrated System of Environmental and Economic Accounting: progress towards a green GDP (presentation, Ms. Yu Fang, Chinese Academy of Environmental Planning) Discussion
2.30 p.m. – 3 p.m.		*Coffee or tea break*
3 p.m. – 5 p.m.	**10**	**Valuation and incentive measures as a tool for mainstreaming (cont'd)** Group exercise (per table): analysis of NBSAPs against target 2 of the SP: identifying national targets, actions and associated indicators Reporting back from group exercise
Monday 16 May		
8. 30 a.m. – 10 a.m.	**10**	**Valuation and incentive measures as a tool for mainstreaming (cont'd)** Addressing incentives that are harmful to biodiversity: lessons learned from the TEEB and the CBD incentives workshops (presentation and brief exercises, Mr. Markus LEHMANN, SCBD) Plenary discussion
10 a.m. – 10.30 a.m.		*Coffee or tea break*
10.30 a.m. – 12.30 p.m.	**10**	**Valuation and incentive measures as a tool for mainstreaming (cont'd)** Promoting positive incentive measures for the conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity (presentation and brief exercises, Ms. Nathalie OLSEN and Andrew SEIDL, IUCN) Japan's experience in providing positive incentives (Kentaro YOSHIDA, Japan) Plenary discussion
12.30 p.m. – 1.30 p.m.		*Lunch*
1.30 p.m. - 3 p.m.	**10**	Group exercise (per table): analysis of NBSAPs against target 3 of the SP: identifying national targets, actions and associated indicators Reporting back from group exercise Discussion: next steps

3 p.m. – 3.30 p.m.		*Coffee or tea break*
3.30 p.m. – 4 p.m.	**11**	**Closing of the workshop**
