



Report of the Regional Capacity-building Workshop on Integration of CMS and CITES Objectives into National Biodiversity Strategies and Action Plans (NBSAPs)

26 – 28 November 2012

Harare, Zimbabwe



I. Introduction

1. A capacity-building workshop for thirteen Anglophone African countries was held on 26 – 28 November 2012 in Harare, Zimbabwe. The workshop brought together 46 national focal points of CBD, CMS and CITES to discuss how to integrate the objectives of biodiversity related conventions into the updating of the National Biodiversity Strategies and Action Plans (NBSAPs). The United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP), in collaboration with the Secretariats of CBD and CMS, organized and conducted the workshop. Financial support was provided by various donors, such as the Ministry of Environment of Sweden, the Government of Japan through the Japan Fund for Biodiversity, and the Government of Germany. Further support in facilitating the arrangements in the host country was provided by the Ministry of Environment and Natural Resources of Zimbabwe.

II. Day One

Opening of the Workshop

2. The workshop was opened at 9:00 am on Monday, 26th November 2012.
3. UNEP Representative, Ms. Kamar Yousuf delivered an opening statement in which she welcomed all representatives expressing her hope that the three-day workshop would give them opportunity to discuss how to create synergies among CBD, CMS and CITES through the updating of National Biodiversity Strategy and Action Plans (NBSAPs). She underscored UNEP's commitment to assist African Parties to come up with ways to improve coherent implementation of biodiversity related conventions at national level. She also expressed her appreciation for the participation of the different focal points from Anglophone African countries, and advised them to promote regional cooperation and collaboration. She acknowledged the support of the partners and urged the representatives to utilize the opportunity availed by the workshop to network and share information with each other.
4. Mr. David Duthie (CBD Secretariat) gave a briefing on the new Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020 and the global Aichi Targets that were adopted in Nagoya, Japan in October 2010. He further informed the representatives that donors pledged to double biodiversity ODA by 2015 during the recently concluded CBD COP-11 that was held in Hyderabad, India in October 2012. Representatives were advised that they should come up with robust NBSAPs so that donors will have confidence in doubling the funding.
5. Mr. Francisco Rilla (CMS Secretariat) welcomed representatives and highlighted that Africa is a priority region for CMS. He expressed his gratitude to be in Africa and encouraged representatives to be highly interactive in their deliberations in order to achieve intended workshop outcomes.
6. Mr. Abraham Matiza, who represented the Ministry of Environment and Natural Resources of Zimbabwe, welcomed the representatives and said that Zimbabwe was privileged to host such a workshop. He also announced that Zimbabwe has embarked on the revision and updating of its NBSAP and has also recently ratified CMS.

Presentations and Discussions

7. The Facilitator of the workshop, Ms. Esther Mwaura gave an overview of the programme of the workshop, objectives and expected outcomes. She drew attention to the structure of the programme which mainly focused on panel discussions, group exercises and case studies to encourage information and experience sharing among the representatives.

Status of NBSAPs Review by Mr. David Duthie

8. Mr. Duthie made a presentation on status of NBSAP review, highlighting the regional workshops the CBD Secretariat has organized in 2011 and 2012. He emphasized that the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011–2020 is a framework for all biodiversity related conventions. Parties were reminded of their obligation to review and update their NBSAPs in line with the new Strategic Plan. Under the new Strategic Plan, Parties are moving away from the conservation mentality to the broader biodiversity issues which are encompassing. He also highlighted that the Strategic Goal A Targets are perhaps the most difficult for biodiversity planners because they go beyond the comfort zone of conservation planners, as it requires us to work with different government agencies and other MEAs.
9. In the ensuing discussion on Aichi Targets, one representative pointed out that Target 2 (*Biodiversity values integrated*) has been a problem within the local government. The representative of Zimbabwe commented on Target 4 (*Sustainable consumption and production*) by confirming that Zimbabwe has guidelines in place on Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) and no development can take place anywhere in the Country without approval of an EIA.
10. On Target 5 (*Habitat loss halved or reduced*), several representatives stressed the importance of taking into consideration the loss of habitat when updating the NBSAPs, as it is a serious problem in many African countries. Furthermore, the representative of Nigeria commented on Target 9 (*Invasive alien species prevented and controlled*) indicating that his country is addressing the issue of invasive alien species by involving local communities. Nigeria has embarked on the revamp of invasive weeds, like water hyacinth and Typha grass through communities' participation. This had been very successful because the communities were given incentives, such as stipend for clearing and were able to utilize and make manure out of the weed for their farms. This led to the removal of the weeds and empowerment of local communities financially.
11. On Target 11 (*Protected areas increased and improved*), some representatives drew attention to the difficulties countries face in maintaining protected areas due to financial constraints. The representative of Nigeria reported that National Park Service has received the concept of two coastal states to establish coastal and marine parks in Nigeria's States. This is to conserve mangrove ecosystems, as well as marine turtle nesting beaches. Nigeria has one of the largest mangrove forests in Africa and third largest in the world but this has not been covered before, and will be the first attempt. The representative of Liberia reported that only 5% of the land has been dedicated as protected area since 2006, but the Government is still working on establishing three more protected areas. South Africa is concentrating on managing the protected areas that are already established with no acquisition of new protected areas. Their concern is, therefore, on how the CBD is going to assess work being done by South Africa because Target 11 requires that Parties increase by at least 17% of terrestrial and inland water areas and 10% of coastal and marine areas. Mr. Duthie clarified that these figures should not be seen as applicable to individual countries, but on a larger scale.
12. Several representatives emphasized the importance of Target 12 (*Extinction prevented*), and the representative of Zimbabwe described that the development of the African Elephant Action Plan within CITES is a cross cutting issue as this is related to the Aichi Target 12 which monitors the extinction risk of threatened species to improve their conservation status, particularly in areas where they are facing decline. Most countries attending this workshop participated in the development and are implementing some of the activities of the Action Plan. It was reported that some countries, such as South Africa, have developed a tracking system by the use of permits to prevent extinction of threatened species.
13. On Target 16 (*Nagoya Protocol on access and benefit-sharing is in force and operational*), the representative of Zimbabwe reported that his country is way ahead of the Nagoya Protocol as they have developed a national legislation on access and benefit-sharing in the form of Statutory Instrument 61 of

2009. Now the opportunity for Zimbabwe is to harmonize the national legislation with the Nagoya Protocol, so that they strengthen biodiversity management by communities in view of the benefits they can get. They are also working on ratification of the Nagoya Protocol. Kenya has also developed its own national legislation in the form of Gazette 61 on access to genetic resources. Several representatives underlined the importance of ratifying the Nagoya Protocol and reported that their countries are in the process of doing so.

14. The representative of South Africa indicated that her country is using Target 18 (*Traditional knowledge respected*) as a basis of implementing the Nagoya Protocol. On Target 19 (*Science-based knowledge improved, shared and applied*), several representatives acknowledged challenges in implementing this Target due to financial constraints and yet there is need for strong capacity building in order to implement it. They also stressed the need to incorporate Target 17 (*NBSAPs updated and implemented*) and Target 20 (*Financial resources mobilized*) so that resources are made available.
15. Mr. Duthie reminded the representatives, as they put in place their NBSAPs, to think critically about institutional frameworks as to whether they are adequate, well equipped and have enough capacity for implementation.

Session on MEAs Cooperation at National Level

16. This session was held in panel discussion with three country examples, Ghana, Liberia and South Africa. Ms. Malta Qwathekana made a presentation on how MEAs cooperate in South Africa; the role of the Department of Environmental Affairs as a focal point for MEAs; and delegation of international responsibilities according to national functions. She stressed the importance of involvement of key stakeholders in biodiversity planning and the establishment of a biodiversity planning forum that sets national priorities and categorizes them into specific outcomes including setting national targets in line with Aichi Targets. She reported that the achievements under the current system include Guidelines for mining and biodiversity, and Guidelines for business and biodiversity. She also explained how South Africa integrated other biodiversity-MEAs objectives into the NBSAPs by promoting coordination, collaboration and on-going communication among the focal points of the MEAs. Under this model of engagement of various stakeholders to communicate their objectives during the NBSAP process, the purpose is to (a) avoid duplication; (b) effectively use resources; (c) equitably distribute resources to national priorities; and (d) facilitate transparency and sharing of information.
17. The second presentation was done by Mr. Alfred Oteng-Yeboah (Ghana) who gave an overview of the evolution of MEAs and what brings biodiversity related conventions closer. He also gave a brief on the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity and the Aichi Targets, and an insight on how to ensure cooperation and mainstreaming at national level. He stressed the importance of: (a) collaboration among national focal points of all biodiversity related conventions to identify areas of concern that need action in their focal areas at the initial stages; (b) developing actions in terms of programmes/projects that take into consideration the objectives of all the biodiversity related conventions; (c) involving the appropriate actors in the discussion of the national strategies, goals, targets and actions from wide array of stakeholders including scientists, policy makers, decision makers, traditional (chiefs and elders) and local authorities, as well as the general public; (d) implementing the action plan through public engagement in proper communication, education and awareness creation methods across the stakeholder community; and (e) report on all issues pertaining to progress, prospects, successes and challenges.
18. Mr. Jonathan Davies presented the Liberian model of biodiversity planning and mainstreaming, as well as cooperation among MEAs at national level. He said there is a Multilateral Environmental Agreements Division responsible for biodiversity MEAs and other conventions, such as UNCCD and UNFCCC, although CITES is housed under the Forestry Authority. This Division is trying to build synergies among all MEAs in Liberia. On updating the NBSAP, Liberia is in the process of reviewing the old version, especially the targets and has carried out assessment on whether those targets have been achieved. This

process is critical as it identifies gaps which need to be addressed by the new NBSAP. The Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011- 2020 requires new approaches to the NBSAPs and Liberia is currently trying to find ways on how to review and update the NBSAP to be in line with the Strategic Plan. Liberia has done a SWOT analysis of the old NBSAP and is targeting specific stakeholders to deal with certain issues. In this regard, there will be a Stakeholders Consultation Workshop to map out the way forward. At this workshop, the national focal points of CBD and other biodiversity related MEAs will participate to come up with a new NBSAP that will be a multi-disciplinary document capturing all the concerns from other biodiversity related MEAs.

19. In the ensuing group discussion, the representatives highlighted the following steps that are important for synergies among biodiversity MEAs through the NBSAPs process: (a) make NBSAPs multi-disciplinary and multi-sectoral that are coordinated horizontally by the CBD national focal points; (b) ensure active participation of other biodiversity related MEAs national focal points by inviting them to relevant NBSAPs meetings; and (c) ensure there is coordination, collaboration and effective communication among focal points in order to come up with sound, well planned NBSAPs inclusive of all MEAs objectives.

Understanding the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020, especially Aichi Target 17
by Mr. Francisco Rilla

20. Mr. Rilla presented general overview of CMS; the development of the Strategic Plan for Migratory Species 2015-2023; importance of capacity-building; and a new way forward for migratory species which is in line with the global Aichi Targets. He explained that CMS is taking a twin track approach which involves the Strategic Plan and a companion guide for implementation of CMS instrument. The purpose of the companion guide is to support CMS Parties through capacity building and technical assistance. Furthermore, he said that CMS has prepared guidelines on NBSAPs for the conservation of migratory species to integrate into the NBSAPs measures, including a review on what the CMS Family has already in place. This review also includes existing NBSAPs to identify links to relevant protected areas and habitats; as well as institutional, legal and policy requirements. He pointed out that the Strategic Plan and companion guide have gone through intensive consultative process which included CMS Parties, CMS instruments, other MEAs, civil society and other stakeholders. The draft Strategic Plan is in three UN languages. Mr. Rilla indicated the priorities for CMS as: NBSAPs; United Nations Decade on Biodiversity 2011-2020; and benefits from the relevant Aichi Targets, especially Target 20 on resource mobilization.
21. He explained that CMS COP-10 which was held in November 2011 in Bergen, Norway, endorsed *Resolution 10.5* that established a Working Group to draft a new CMS Strategic Plan for the period 2015-2023. A final draft of the Strategic Plan is to be presented to CMS COP-11 in 2014. Each CMS Region elected members to the Strategic Plan Working Group (SPWG). The Chairs of the CMS Standing Committee and the CMS Scientific Council are ex-officio members. CMS partners – secretariats of MEAs and non-governmental organizations - and CMS experts are welcome to contribute substantively to the Group as observers. Two reports were produced: (a) Review of the CMS Strategic Plan 2006-2014, including lessons learned; and (b) Proposals for the CMS Strategic Plan 2015-2023. The SPWG agreed that the Strategic Plan should be for migratory species in general to focus on the issue rather than on the CMS instruments.
22. A dedicated page has been created on the CMS website to provide information about the work of the SPWG, where relevant documents are made available as work progresses, in particular to support outreach and consultations by the Group and other stakeholders. Furthermore, the SPWG spent some time on issues, such as the need to reinforce the integration of migratory species into revisions of the NBSAPs. There is guidance within the CMS on this issue, but it is important to emphasize the urgency of the matter given that in many countries the NBSAPs are currently being revised in light of the Aichi Biodiversity Targets and any further delay will make it difficult to integrate migratory issues at a later stage. Along the

same lines, CMS should already engage actively in the UN Decade on Biodiversity and benefit from the relevant Aichi Biodiversity Targets, in particular Target 20 on resource mobilization which is for biodiversity in general, including migratory species.

III. Day Two

Presentations and Discussions

23. This session started with the role of implementing and setting tangible targets for NBSAPs as part of national development processes. Four representatives (Ethiopia, Egypt, Nigeria and Zimbabwe) presented their countries' experiences in NBSAPs development and implementation. Dr. Misikire Tessema made a presentation on Ethiopia's experience by acknowledging the challenges of implementing the old NBSAP as it was generally weak, especially regarding protected areas, enclosures, and plantations. The major reasons for its ineffective implementation are the following: poor assumptions; high optimism; lack of ownership to the implementation; and lack of clarity in the coordination structure. He said lessons learned from the previous NBSAP include: (a) that it should not be treated as a project; (b) develop realistic targets and corresponding actions (aligning with governments priorities); (c) involve all stakeholders and communities at all levels; (d) assign ownership through MoUs to agree on actions by the stakeholders; and (e) create a strong national coordination structure and risk management strategy. Dr. Tessema emphasized the important steps Ethiopia is taking to update its NBSAP by establishing a national steering committee and technical team that is trained on methodologies of NBSAP updating. This includes stocktaking exercises; drafting strategy, targets and action plan; and review stakeholder workshops. He also drew attention to some constraints to the NBSAP revision, such as lack of well-organized data and weak participation of stakeholders. Furthermore, the roles of NGOs and other MEAs in the process of implementation are not clear and need to be addressed.
24. Dr. Luay El-Sayed gave a presentation describing Egypt's biodiversity, eco-zones and the involvement of local communities in biodiversity conservation efforts. He reported that conservation of biodiversity is being challenged by rapid population growth and the massive size of development needed to support it. Egypt's NBSAP was prepared to cover the period from 1997 to 2017 and sets goals for the protection of ecosystems and their sustainable management. It will be reviewed and updated in line with the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020.
25. Giving it from CMS perspective, Mr. John Mshelbwala (Nigeria) drew attention to the importance of identifying synergies with other MEAs, specifically CMS, through the NBSAPs process because our collective concern for the conservation of species and their habitats; the desire to have healthy ecosystems capable of providing services; and to avoid duplication of efforts because resources available for conservation are limited. He outlined the guidelines on integration of migratory species concerns into the updating of NBSAPs and suggested the following process: (a) CMS focal points establishing collaboration with the national focal points of CBD and other biodiversity related conventions; (b) CMS focal points becoming familiar with CBD decisions, work programmes, targets and their relevance for CMS; and (c) CMS focal points becoming fully involved in the NBSAPs process and providing basic information on migratory species to include into the NBSAPs. He also suggested that NBSAP implementation can be carried out by: promoting enhanced monitoring of and research into migratory species, targets and indicators; promoting the establishment of protected area networks as beneficial for migratory species; restoration of habitats for migratory species; and provisions of sustainable use of migratory species in the NBSAP. Mr. Mshelbwala highlighted the need to address the following threats in the NBSAPs as they relate to migratory species: climate change, invasive alien species, and threats caused by activities of the economic sector.
26. Mr. Abraham Matiza presented Zimbabwe's experience in the updating of NBSAP and how can NBSAP be an effective part of cross-sectoral government policy. The new generation of NBSAP is an opportunity

to mainstream biodiversity and anchor its implementation into national development frameworks. He said that Zimbabwe has already established a National Biodiversity Forum (NBF) comprising five thematic working groups which will accompany the process of developing national targets, updating the NBSAP and preparing the national reports. The membership of the NBF has been drawn from professional representatives of the main biodiversity stakeholders. The five thematic working groups include: (1) Forestry biodiversity, (2) Agro-biodiversity, (3) Protected Areas, (4) Inland waters and Wetlands, and (5) Policy and legislation. Thus, updating and implementing Zimbabwe's NBSAP will be a widely inclusive and participative process. This will give Zimbabwe the opportunity to use its NBSAP as an effective cross-sectoral government policy and planning tool.

27. Mr. Matiza pointed out that Zimbabwe will use a mechanism already in place to identify synergies among biodiversity MEAs through the updating of the NBSAP. He reported that Zimbabwe has an inter-ministerial Task Team that looks at all international agreements and also does monitoring and evaluation. It is based in the President's Office and some of the key ministries that comprise the Task Team are Ministry of Finance; Ministry of Economic Planning and Investment Promotion; and Ministry of Agriculture. He stated that Zimbabwe's national aspirations are contained in the National Environmental Policy and the process of reviewing the NBSAP will draw from this Policy. During the NBSAPs updating process, Zimbabwe will also be guided by the Medium Term Plan (2011-2015) and National Vision 2020. The Medium Term Plan marks a return to strategic development planning in Zimbabwe. It outlines the economic policies, projects and programmes that will guide the Country and set the national priorities for five years 2011-2015. Mr. Matiza reported that resource mobilization, especially for biodiversity conservation, has always been a problem in Zimbabwe maybe because people do not understand the value of biodiversity. However, the Government has involved the private sector as much as possible like banks, insurance companies and big mining companies that are somewhat linked to biodiversity.
28. This session triggered a lot of discussion among the representatives. Some expressed concerns on how countries should ensure that resources are available for NBSAPs reviews and updates. Others stated that a lot of emphasis on the NBSAPs is on what to do resulting in publication for the shelf; they are not concentrating on how we are going to do it. The representative of Nigeria shared experience from Costa Rica and Rwanda that are embracing the green economy. Costa Rica has been focusing on green growth so much that they have stopped mining and their local communities have been empowered. Rwanda is also focusing on green growth. They shared that if African governments could take bold steps in embracing the green economy, then it would go a long way in conserving our biodiversity.
29. The representative of BirdLife International pointed out that strategic environmental assessments ensure that issues to do with the biodiversity management are identified at policy level; therefore, if this is made mandatory in the new NBSAPs, it will go a long way in biodiversity conservation. One representative stated that many governments do not appreciate biodiversity as a resource so in most cases it is not included in national priorities in our countries. Therefore, it is time to have targets set that raise the profile of biodiversity even if it goes beyond national priorities. African countries should strive to raise biodiversity profile as biodiversity is priceless. Another representative said that some requirements for migratory species under CMS are such that they are trans-boundary; hence, this will raise the status of biodiversity as alluded to earlier.

Synergies and Cooperation: Options for the Biodiversity related Conventions by Peter Herkenrath (UNEP-WCMC)

30. In his presentation, Mr. Herkenrath pointed out the principles for synergies as party-driven, autonomy of MEAs, step-by-step iterative approach (no big jumps); form follows function and support to national implementation. He explained different areas for synergies, such as Area 1 (*Science-policy interface*) which could be carried out by joint requests to IPBES for global, regional and sub-regional assessments, collaborate in sub-global assessment processes, align indicator development (global, regional and national

levels) and joint recognition of traditional knowledge. Area 2 (*Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020 and NBSAPs*) entails ownership of Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020 for all the biodiversity MEAs; aligning strategic plans across MEAs; ownership of NBSAPs for all biodiversity MEAs, allowing for synergistic party positions across MEAs. Area 3 (*National reporting*) takes into account that reporting systems of conventions have evolved differently; there is a substantial reporting burden for Parties; and reporting rates are different. He added that an integrated approach to reporting to Rio Conventions has been tested by pilot countries through a UNEP/GEF project, including testing a joint reporting format. At national level, coordination between focal points/agencies will be imperative. Integrated data and information management and also sharing of national experience is important. Area 4 (*Capacity-building*) entails joint capacity-building initiative for implementation; access funding for capacity-building through the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020 and NBSAPs; and collaborate on capacity-building through IPBES. He also discussed the synergy options in the special case on implementation of the Global Strategy for Plant Conservation in Africa, for which a UNEP/GEF project is under discussion. He asked countries where this has been implemented if there are synergies among biodiversity related conventions.

Country and regional experiences - Case Studies

31. During the afternoon session, three countries (Uganda, Ghana and Kenya) presented cases studies on challenges in implementing biodiversity MEAs and the level of support needed to integrate other MEAs objectives in the updating of NBSAPs. Mr. James Lutalo started his presentation by stressing the importance of biodiversity for Uganda as over 80% of the population (current estimate about 34 million people) depend on subsistence agriculture and biodiversity for income generation and these are mainly the poor rural communities. Therefore, integration of CMS and CITES objectives into NBSAPs and mainstreaming biodiversity in the development processes are crucial. He said that MEAs implementation would greatly benefit from a coordinated approach to achieve cost-effectiveness. Unfortunately, focal points for MEAs are to a large extent spread in different government agencies in Uganda and are not effectively coordinated. He also identified key challenges to the synergistic implementation of MEAs at national level, such as: (a) lack of formal structure or forum for effective collaboration between government agencies placed under different sectors, hence leading to poor coordination between national focal points; (b) inadequate mainstreaming of biodiversity related MEAs into the overall national development plan; (c) CMS objectives are overshadowed and recognized only by default; (d) lack of framework and consistent preparation for MEA COPs and reporting after meetings to guide decision makers on national planning and appropriate resource allocation; and (e) lack of data/information management system to guide decision making to facilitate information sharing. Furthermore, he pointed out the following opportunities to address the challenges: development of a Clearing House Mechanism – coordination and information sharing across sectors under CBD; CMS family manual for national focal points/Migratory Species Strategic Plan; ensuring appropriate policy, legal and institutional framework in place to guide implementation of MEAs; and valuation of biodiversity and ecosystem services and their linkage to national development.
32. In his presentation, Mr. Eric Okoree drew attention to the different institutions where biodiversity MEAs focal points are placed in Ghana. For example, the CBD national focal point is with the Ministry of Environment, Science and Technology; the CITES and CMS national focal points are with the Ministry of Land and Natural Resources. He also explained the structure of the NBSAP and its targets that have been developed for different thematic areas. The content of the NBSAP has been categorized into short, medium and long terms and linked to the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020 and the Aichi Targets. Furthermore, he highlighted a number of challenges Ghana faces in updating the NBSAP, such as developing a national document that is expected to be implemented by different stakeholders/sectors; getting the NBSAP into the national development agenda; ensuring adequate/effective political will; and conducting effective communication, education and public awareness on the NBSAP. To overcome these challenges, Mr. Okoree proposed the following solutions: different stakeholders to be represented in the NBSAP steering committee; stakeholders to be involved in the drafting of the document; integrate the

NBSAP into the national development agenda through consultation with the senior decision makers; and ensure the engagement of the public in the updating of the NBSAP.

33. Mr. James Njogu gave a presentation on challenges Kenya faces in the implementation of biodiversity MEAs; types and level of support needed to integrate other biodiversity MEAs objectives into the updating of NBSAP. He reported that some of the challenges are: awareness about MEAs is limited to a few individuals; many stakeholders with sometimes conflicting interest; lack of coordination and cooperation among national focal points of different MEA; funding for implementation; and inadequate political will. He stated that the major elements of the previous NBSAP included strategy; identified goals and objectives; institutional capacities and linkages; gender issues; policy legislation; poverty alleviation; and identification and monitoring of species. He further reported that the action plan identifies specific policy objectives and actions to be carried out over a period of time that should result in enhanced conservation and sustainable utilization of biodiversity. Kenya's updating of its NBSAP is underway in line with the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020 and the Aichi Targets. A series of stakeholder consultation meetings have taken place and a draft is in place. However, more consultation is needed, as well as involving national focal points of other biodiversity MEAs to mainstream their objectives. To achieve the desired outcome of the revision, formation of a task force is imperative. He also mentioned that data collection through regional workshop is necessary, as well as the compilation of the data. Validation workshop will need to be held and adopted by policy makers. He emphasized that lack of accurate data in biodiversity is also a major difficulty. Furthermore, he stated that there are weak institutional arrangements for planning and managing the utilization of biodiversity. The other challenge is lack of political support and of a national policy on the conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity. Mr. Njogu concluded his presentation by stating that if Kenya centralizes the MEAs national focal points, then this approach will be fairly new. It could counter mainstream trends in devolving governance. Effectiveness of centralization is yet to be demonstrated. This system would delink between implementers and negotiators requiring enhanced coordination. He acknowledged that centralized or decentralized coordination of MEAs national focal points has advantages and its disadvantages. NBSAP is a great opportunity for coordination irrespective of above.

Reflection on the countries' case studies

34. The representative of Somalia expressed concern on the lack of coordination among government agencies due to the protracted conflict. He said that government officials change as politics of the Country changes. These changes normally affect MEAs focal points who are influenced by politicians and can be changed/transferred at any point from one office to another thereby affecting institutional memory and hence effectiveness of the affected government agencies. A major concern is now on how the Country starts coordinating and implementing MEAs to fulfill its obligations. The representative of Ghana reminded the workshop that environment is one of the three pillars of sustainable development and yet it is the weakest. If countries want to raise the profile of biodiversity, there is need to strengthen the environmental pillar through raising the profile of biodiversity at the highest levels of government. The representative of Kenya raised a question on how a national biodiversity committee should be constituted and how strong it should be. His second question was on how institutional frameworks can be strengthened; is the focal point an individual or an institution? It was urged to de-link the focal point from an individual, but link to an office/institution so that when the individual is transferred to another work, then the institution is maintained. The representative of Ghana, in response to the above questions, gave an example of Ghana's model whereby the National Biodiversity Committee's (NBC) constitution is vested with the Minister of Environment, Science and Technology, and is spread among biodiversity institutions across the country. However, the NBC is weak as it has no legal basis; hence its role remains advisory. He stressed the need to have a National Biodiversity Authority in the country which will be legally backed.

35. During the group discussion, the representatives identified seven key challenges that were experienced in the past and that need to be addressed in the updating of the NBSAPs. These challenges are the following: (1) NBSAPs were not nationally-driven; (2) inadequate political will; (3) no resource mobilization for the implementation of NBSAPs; (4) limited stakeholder involvement/participation during the preparation phase; (5) scattered MEAs national focal points in different government agencies do not communicate and collaborate; (6) limited availability and access to relevant data/information; and (7) previous NBSAPs only focused on CBD objectives overlooking other biodiversity related MEAs.
36. The representative also identified the following resources that can be sought in the next three years so that Parties are able to finalize new generation NBSAPs: skilled human resources (expertise) both internally and externally; appropriate institutional arrangements/mechanisms; financial resources (in-country, GEF or ODA); and relevant institutions with comparative advantages.

IV. Day Three

Presentations and Discussions

37. On Wednesday morning 28 November, Mr. Jonathan Davies (Liberia) raised his concerns that the entry points for CMS and CITES for integration into NBSAPs had not been sufficiently explored yet in the workshop. In the discussion, possible entry points were considered, including the relevant Aichi Targets for CITES and CMS (e.g. Target 12 for CITES, several targets relevant for sustainable use), which need to be looked at by the relevant players at the national level. These relevant players need to be brought in by design not by default. It was suggested that the CBD, CITES and CMS focal points at national level systematically go through the Aichi Targets and identify the entry points. It was also pointed to the need to convince key decision-makers at higher level to promote the integration. Mr. Francisco Rilla (CMS Secretariat) offered to be contacted for guidance on the integration of CMS objectives into NBSAPs. Ms. Kamar Yousuf (UNEP) pointed to the study undertaken by the Environment Management Group on contribution of UN agencies and conventions to the Aichi Targets.
38. Mr. Ken Mwathe (BirdLife International) gave a presentation on NBSAPs– integration, coordination and the role of NGOs. He referred to some key features of NBSAPs, including the need for involving stakeholders and for integrating other MEAs, and challenges for NBSAPs. BirdLife is a partnership active in 117 countries, focusing on species and sites, sustainability and people. In Africa, BirdLife is represented in 24 countries. He mentioned the network of 10,000 Important Bird Areas around the world, with 1,500 sites identified in Africa. He referred to birds being very useful indicators and to BirdLife’s role as the thematic focal point for birds of the CBD Clearing-House Mechanism and the authority for birds for the IUCN Red List. He asked some key questions about the involvement of stakeholders in NBSAPs updating and implementation, as well as about integration, synergies and the role of NGOs in the process. The Wings Over Wetlands Project is an example of collaboration of governments and stakeholders at the international level, and the National Liaison Committee for monitoring of Important Bird Areas in Kenya as an example at the national level. Mr. Mwathe presented a coordination framework for NBSAPs, including goal, high-level support, legal constitution, integration of MEA focal points and stakeholders, integration into national development process, and persistence. He stated that NGOs can provide data sets on species and sites, lessons and best practices from projects, toolkits and awareness raising material. NGOs can also be helpful in mobilizing political will. In the discussion, the work of BirdLife was appreciated, including the effective use of its network at the national level and its political support to the biodiversity agenda.
39. The Session then broke into working groups, along the sub-regions present at the workshop. Groups were instructed to draft national plans for taking the integration of CMS and CITES objectives into the updating of NBSAPs, including sub-regional cooperation. After the group work, Mr. David Duthie said that for the moment he acts as the contact person on NBSAPs issues for Africa within the CBD

Secretariat. He introduced a mapping of the Aichi Targets against other biodiversity related conventions including the objectives and targets of the strategic plans of the other conventions produced by IUCN. This addresses the concerns discussed earlier in the morning session and will be made available to workshop participants.

40. The working groups of the morning session then reported back to the meeting, beginning with the north-eastern African Group of Egypt, Ethiopia and Somalia. Dr. Luay El-Sayed demonstrated the location of the focal points to MEAs in the Egyptian Government and the steps for updating the NBSAP. He said that a national workshop with focal points of other MEAs and stakeholders will be organized, which will identify the areas of cooperation and synergies with other MEAs. Due to the conflict, as Dr. Abdikadir Sidi Sheikh explained, Somalia has been absent from the multilateral environmental fora and has not implemented the obligations of MEAs that it is party to. Somalia joined CBD three years ago and has sought the support of FAO in the NBSAP development. The NBSAP will be developed with the involvement of many stakeholders. Mr. Kumara Wakjira explained how different focal points for conventions are situated in the government institutions of Ethiopia. The focal points for CMS and CITES, as well as relevant authorities are members of the National Steering Committee and will participate in a kick-off workshop for the process of updating the NBSAP. In the near future, further meetings with the focal points of other biodiversity MEAs are planned in order to develop a work plan for integrating these conventions into the NBSAP. This work plan will be presented to the higher authorities. At the regional level, as Mr. Wakjira pointed out, the need for a regional Biodiversity Strategy and Action Plan (BSAP) has been recognized by this morning's Working Group and he explained a process for developing the regional BSAP through cooperation among Egypt, Ethiopia and Somalia.
41. For the southern Africa Group (Mauritius, South Africa, and Zimbabwe), Ms. Olga Kumalo reported about South Africa's plans for a workshop on integrating the other biodiversity MEAs into the NBSAP planned for February, covering stocktaking of the existing situation, advantages and disadvantages, identification of gaps and how to address them. For the context of the NBSAP, consultations with internal and external stakeholders will be undertaken, awareness will be raised and roles be identified. Strategic planning sessions with stakeholders are envisaged. Ms. Kumalo explained an outline for the review of the action plan addressing key issues of the NBSAP; this will include projects of biodiversity related MEAs. In addition, transboundary issues will be included. Mr. Parmananda Ragen reported that in Mauritius a workshop is planned with the involvement of biodiversity MEAs focal points, which will develop a plan for the integration of non-CBD objectives into the NBSAP to be presented to the higher level authorities. Mr. Clifford Tafangenyasha explained for Zimbabwe that a Biodiversity Forum will meet on 30th November, including all relevant MEAs focal points and NGO stakeholders. He described the challenges and the plans for specific action. Feedback from ministers will be sought by February 2013, followed by the elaboration of the NBSAP and a final validation workshop in late 2013. The action plan is to be completed by March 2014. He also reported that Zimbabwe collaborates with other countries in southern Africa.
42. Mr. Laisser Lotha Sadiki reported back from the eastern African Group (Kenya, Tanzania, and Uganda). For Tanzania, he explained that an NBSAP Steering Committee will be established, including the other MEAs focal points. The Committee will identify further stakeholders, develop a budget and mobilize funding for the process. Subsequently, a capacity-building workshop for all stakeholders will be held. The NBSAP will then be developed with the help of a consultant. Thematic groups will develop technical input. A zonal consultative workshop for regional and district secretariats will be conducted. This will be followed by a national stakeholder workshop and an action plan addressing all targets will be drafted. The final version of the NBSAP will be presented to the Parliament and the Cabinet. This is envisaged to happen by the end of 2013. Mr. Aggrey Rwetsiba reported that in Uganda a meeting of the biodiversity MEAs focal points will discuss the integration of their conventions' objectives into the NBSAP. A capacity-building workshop with stakeholders including the other MEAs focal points already took place. The process also involves a biodiversity assessment, the development of the actual strategy and the action plan, the implementation phase, monitoring and evaluation. The fifth national report to the CBD will

inform about the process and its results. Mr. James Njogu said that the same process will also be followed by the other eastern African countries present at this meeting, including his own country, Kenya. He explained that transboundary cooperation will be part of the NBSAPs development in the countries, particularly aided by the CMS and the migratory species approach, which is very relevant for eastern Africa.

43. Ms. Amie Touray reported back from the western African Group (Ghana, Liberia, Nigeria, and The Gambia). She presented an outline of the steps to be taken for integrating MEAs objectives into NBSAPs by the four countries. This includes a consultative forum ensuring that all MEAs focal points are members of the NBSAPs steering committee and the integration of transboundary programmes into the NBSAPs of the countries involved. In 2013, the option of subregional meetings and exchange visits between countries will be explored. UNEP, through the Regional Office for Africa, is requested to forward the outcomes of the workshop to AMCEN. Mr. Francisco Rilla said that the CMS Secretariat will conduct regional capacity-building workshops for Anglophone and Francophone African countries, which might provide a forum for the envisaged sub-regional meetings. He asked for countries to offer to host these workshops. Mr. John Mshelbwala (Nigeria) pointed out that once a similar workshop to the current one has been conducted for the Francophone countries of central and western Africa, contact should be made with these countries and coordination also be sought through ECOWAS and AMCEN. Ms. Malta Qwathekana (South Africa) also mentioned a potential role of SADC in this regard.

V. Conclusions

44. At the end of the workshop, the representatives understood the issues of integration of other biodiversity MEAs objectives into NBSAPs and expressed their interest in replicating this workshop in their respective countries. They also plan to develop common best practice guidelines with tangible targets to improve policy, legal and administrative coordination of biodiversity related MEAs in the NBSAP process. It was agreed that CBD national focal points will be central to facilitating an inclusive and collaborative process with other MEAs focal points towards updating and implementing the NBSAPs. The representatives also plan to raise the issue of synergies among biodiversity related MEAs to a higher political level. Immediate follow-up actions as agreed by the workshop include: (a) UNEP to share all workshop material with the representatives; (b) send finalized outlines of national and subregional tasks and timelines, as begun on the third day of the workshop in the subregional working groups, to Ms. Kamar Yousuf who will make them available to workshop participants; and (c) forward the outcomes of this workshop to AMCEN through the UNEP Regional Office for Africa.

VI. Evaluation and Closure of the Workshop

45. The representatives evaluated the workshop through written evaluation forms and expressed their satisfaction with the quality of discussions, presentations and their interaction. Ms. Esther Mwaura said that all material of the workshop, including presentations, will be handed to participants in an electronic form. She thanked representatives for their constructive engagement. Ms. Kamar Yousuf stated she very much appreciated the quality of the workshop and that she believes the objectives were indeed achieved. She expressed her hope that the issue of integration of other MEAs' objectives into NBSAPs would be raised to higher political level by the representatives. Mr. Abraham Matiza, speaking on behalf of the Government of Zimbabwe, thanked the participants and the representatives of UNEP, CBD and CMS for making the workshop a success. He explained the arrangements for the visit this afternoon to an environmental education center near-by and this evening's reception hosted by the Ministry of the Environment and Natural Resources of Zimbabwe. The workshop concluded at 2.50 pm.