

Biodiversity Planning An Assessment of National **Biodiversity Strategies and Action Plans**

for policy-making to meet the challenges of sustainable development

Main Findings of Assessment Team (Lead author: Christian Prip, Denmark)



NBSAP project objectives

- Review experience gained by parties in development, implementation and revision of NBSAPs - with a specific focus on developing countries' experience;
- review the extend of mainstreaming into policy, plans and projects, in particular into policies for alleviating poverty and achieving the MDGs;
- identify the obstacles/barriers; and
- develop recommendations for national biodiversity planning.



Method

- ToR for study were derived from elements of NBSAP guidance included in CoP decision IX/8;
- Desk review of all NBSAPs posted on CBD website;
- Collected information from CBD regional workshops on NBSAPs;
- Country studies in Australia, Nepal, Malaysia, Benin, Cameroon, Mexico, St. Kitts & Nevis, St. Lucia, and Canada.



Main Conclusions

<u>Generally</u>, a positive trend:

- picture is more nuanced than described in most earlier reviews;
- that nearly all CBD parties have prepared NBSAP is in itself an achievement;
- 2nd generation NBSAPs are better prepared, more focused, more based on mainstreaming and on self-reliance; <u>but</u>
- NBSAPs have not been able to attenuate the main drivers of biodiversity loss.





NBSAP process

- 171 countries (89%) have prepared NBSAPs;
- 13 countries are in the process of preparing NBSAPs;
- 9 countries have not yet prepared NBSAPs (of which 2 are new Parties); and
- 49 countries have revised NBSAPs, or are in the process of doing so.





NBSAP process (2)

- most countries prepared NBSAPs with participation of stakeholders, but indigenous communities, women, industry largely missing;
- most countries created coordination structures to oversee implementation, but often these do not function well; and
- trend towards greater political ownership at higher level - early NBSAPs typically approved only by responsible ministry, newer NBSAPs often approved at Cabinet or Parliament level.
- few countries have used tools other than NBSAPs for national biodiversity planning;

Getting the NBSAP planning and preparation process right is crucial to implementation!



Knowledge base

- Most countries have included improvement of the knowledge base as an important objective;
- countries generally have only a basic knowledge of the state of biodiversity in their countries – although this is sufficient to act;
- NBSAPs would have been a good opportunity to increase/better document knowledge about biodiversity.



meet the challenges of sustainable development



Coverage of the CBD objectives

- Very uneven focus of CBD objectives;
- conservation features dominantly, especially protected areas;
- sustainable use appear mostly in very general terms;
- ABS is absent from most NBSAPs.

meet the challenges of sustainable development



sustainable development

Mainstreaming with higher and cross-sectoral plans and policies

- Most NBSAPs portray biodiversity as an asset for, rather than an impediment to, development but:
- not all NBSAPs place biodiversity in a broader development policy context, some NBSAPs may have strong emphasis on development, but MDG plans have no focus on biodiversity;
- improving, but generally poor, reflection of biodiversity in MDG plans. Countries seem unaware that the 2010 biodiversity target was included as a target under MDG 7.



Mainstreaming with higher and cross sectoral plans and policies

- EIA is generally covered in NBSAPs, but SEA is included in only a few recent NBSAPs;
- the Ecosystem Approach (EA) is often mentioned, but has usually not been applied as an overall planning tool;
- few NBSAPs fully reflect the Millennium Ecosystem Assessment and its conceptual framework; and
- most NBSAPs highlight the need to valuate and create economic incentives for biodiversity, but few move beyond general statements.



Sectoral mainstreaming

- Many NBSAPs focus on mainstreaming into forestry;
- Fewer focus on agriculture;
- and even less on fisheries;
- Mainstreaming with climate change and other biodiversity-related conventions is rather weak, although some positive signs emerging with recent NAPAs; and
- CEPA features prominently in most NBSAPs, but often as a "add-on"



National targets and prioritisation

- Only a few countries in newer NBSAPs include time bound and measurable targets;
- Very few have quantified targets;
- Few countries prioritise between actions in their action plans;
- Generally very few NBSAPs with mechanisms for monitoring and review at country level.





Sub-national BSAPs

 Only a minority of countries, have provisions for sub-national BSAPs, but this number is increasing.





Financing implementation

- few countries have strategies/plans for financing NBSAPs – most action plans are just "wish lists" of projects without secure funding;
- newer NBSAPs have a more programmatic approach.





nal Year of Biodiversity

NBSAPs in different regions

- few consistent differences <u>between</u> regions, but big differences between NBSAPs <u>within</u> regions;
- the Pacific region seems to be the most "homogenous", with a strong emphasis on indigenous people, ABS and climate change;
- development status does not predetermine the quality of NBSAPs.





CBD decisions work programmes, guidelines etc.

- Very few countries use CBD decisions/Programmes of Work (POWs)/ Guidelines as the basis for planning in NBSAPs
- The PoW Protected Areas and the Global Plant Conservation Strategy (GPCS) are exceptions.





Conclusions on Implementation of NBSAPs

- Generally, 4th National Reoport and CBD NBSAP workshops show a more nuanced picture of NBSAPs, indicating a bigger impact than previously assumed and reported;
- Some countries have reported full implementation of 1st NBSAPs, <u>but</u> gaps and constraints to implementation are reported in nearly all other countries.





sustainable development

Proportion of NBSAP activities/ elements implemented:

- Djibouti 30% of projects carried out;
- France 32% of actions completed; (additional 54% initiated; 14% have yet to be launched)
- Krygyzstan 30% of strategic components implemented;
- Togo 40% of 119 priority actions implemented;
- Turkmenistan 49% of objectives & activities implemented;

Information derived from 4th NR: UNEP/CBD/SP/EW/Inf.1



Progress in NBSAP implementation

Progress in implementation of NBSAPs has mostly been in the following areas:

- improving the knowledge base;
- communication, education and public awareness;
- coverage of protected areas; and
- development of new legislation.





Obstacles to NBSAP implementation

- Major design faults:
 - over-ambitious, un-prioritised, under-funded plans poorly communicated to the wider audience are the main obstacles to implementation;
- and, as noted in the CoP X/2 Strategic Plan:
 - lack of financial human and technical resources,
 - lack of use of economic measures,
 - lack of mainstreaming and horizontal integration/cooperation,
 - lack of public education and awareness at all levels.