



NBSAPs:

the Role of Local Governments

Caribbean

all Caribbean countries without local Governments: similarities
in local governments

larger Caribbean
countries with local
governments:
collaboration with local
government



Current History of Engagement with Local Governments

text in MEAs until very recently

Typically: poor cooperation between national and local

poor understanding of potential contribution

no requirement for **SAPs** and no engagement with NBSAPs



How to engage with local governments?

Collective impact or contribution (e.g. protected areas)

Examples: 3% 50% 75%

People power, political power, corporate power

Success:

Reaching people with messages

Listening to people to create sustainable plans



Governments?

Coordination structures (for mainstreaming biodiversity across sectors) may exist, but often have **limited ownership at the subnational**

NBSAPs place a strong emphasis on working at the national level, and only a minority **explicitly acknowledge the benefits of sub-national BSAPs.**”

Communication of the NBSAP to sub-national authorities and the **empowerment of these to act** has often been **unsuccessful due to weak local institutional capacity**”

“Second generation NBSAPs have typically been prepared through a **broader, longer and more structured preparatory**



Biodiversity Planning
an assessment of national
biodiversity strategies
and action plans

governments?



- 6. “...Most NBSAPs have been prepared through stakeholder involvement, but **...subnational authorities have not been engaged**” “...(there is a) need in many to identify and involve sub-national stakeholders in the national process”
- 11. “**Decisions and actions that affect biodiversity are often taken at the local level, and the overall NBSAP will only be implemented if corresponding strategies and action plans are also developed and implemented at the relevant sub-national level(s). Decentralization of biodiversity planning to sub-national levels has been largely neglected in existing NBSAPs; this is one of the main causes of poor NBSAP implementation**”

Governments?

because the links between the national and local levels have often been missing in NBSAP development and implementation, the benefits of **community management** of biodiversity have not been demonstrated. As a consequence, policies determined at the national level are often ineffective or ignored at the local level. Wider use of sub-national BSAPs would address this issue.”

... in biodiversity planning... **locally-determined and implemented activities** are often **most-effective** and lead to **better outcomes** than nationally-determined and managed projects.”

There needs to be **increased support for community development** and this should be linked to strengthening national implementation mechanisms especially with regard to mainstreaming biodiversity into broader plans and policies and to



LBSAPs are not necessarily aligned with NBSAPs

Lessons are being learned but not necessarily shared

- Building relationships
- Integration into overarching plans
- Public participation is key
- Much to be gained through collaboration

Partnership has developed between ICLEI and the CBD

Key decisions (IX/28; X/22) and Ramsar Resolutions have been adopted

Meetings
Increasingly high-profile:
Cities for Biodiversity
in the COP
agenda for the first time
at COP 11



Engage with local governments directly or through the relevant ministry

Engage not as an additional task but as a way to increase efficiency and reach national targets

NBSAPs provide the perfect starting place for cooperation

NBSAP compilation draw on local government lessons; local government engagement with communities

NBSAP compilation ensure alignment and feedback