



## Convention on Biological Diversity

Distr.  
GENERAL

UNEP/CBD/COP/9/14/Rev.1\*  
24 April 2008

ORIGINAL: ENGLISH

---

### CONFERENCE OF THE PARTIES TO THE CONVENTION ON BIOLOGICAL DIVERSITY

Ninth meeting

Bonn, 19-30 May 2008

Item 3.7 of the provisional agenda\*\*

### IMPLEMENTATION OF THE CONVENTION AND ITS STRATEGIC PLAN

*Revised note by the Executive Secretary*

#### I. INTRODUCTION

1. As indicated in the chapeau of Article 23, paragraph 4, of the Convention on Biological Diversity, the main purpose of the Conference of the Parties is to keep under review the implementation of the Convention. In paragraph 23 of its decision VII/30, the Conference of the Parties decided to allocate adequate time in subsequent meetings to consider progress in the implementation of the Convention and the Strategic Plan as well as achievements leading up to the 2010 target, and this was reflected also in the multi-year programme of work of the Conference of the Parties up to 2010 (decision VII/31). Further, by decision VII/30, the Conference of the Parties established an Ad Hoc Open-ended Working Group on Review of Implementation of the Convention, to assist the Conference of the Parties in keeping under review the implementation of the Convention.

2. An overview report on "Implementation of the Convention and the Strategic Plan and progress towards the 2010 target" was prepared for the first meeting of the Working Group on Review of Implementation (UNEP/CBD/WGRI/1/2), and summarized for the subsequent meeting of the Conference of the Parties (UNEP/CBD/COP/8/15). Taking into account the recommendations of the Working Group, the Conference of the Parties, in decision VIII/8, called for an in-depth review of Goals 2 & 3 of the Strategic Plan, to be conducted by the Working Group at its second meeting. Also at its eighth meeting, the Conference of the Parties recommended that regional and/or subregional meetings be convened in order to discuss national experiences in implementing national biodiversity strategies and action plans, and the integration of biodiversity concerns into relevant sectors, including consideration of obstacles and ways and means for overcoming the obstacles (decision VIII/8, paragraph 6).

3. The Working Group on Review of Implementation, at its second meeting prepared a draft decision (UNEP/CBD/COP/4, annex) including consolidated guidance on national biodiversity strategies and action plans and priority areas for capacity-building, access to and transfer of technology. This draft decision is also contained in the compilation of draft decisions prepared for the ninth meeting of the

---

\* Updated to include the results of the NBSAP Workshop for South America, Rio Branco, Brazil, 31 March – 4 April 2008

\*\* UNEP/CBD/COP/9/1.

/...

In order to minimize the environmental impacts of the Secretariat's processes, and to contribute to the Secretary-General's initiative for a C-Neutral UN, this document is printed in limited numbers. Delegates are kindly requested to bring their copies to meetings and not to request additional copies.

Conference of the Parties (UNEP/CBD/COP/9/1/Add.2). The Conference of the Parties may wish to adopt the draft decision in line with paragraph 1 (a) of Working Group recommendation 2/1.

4. The Working Group also recommended that the Conference of the Parties:

(a) Consider developing a framework of options to mobilize human and technological resources at national level, drawing on, and taking full consideration of, existing instruments, initiatives, and experiences (recommendation 2/1 paragraph 1(b)); and

(b) Consider the continuation of the Ad Hoc Open-ended Working Group on Review of Implementation of the Convention taking into account the importance of making progress in the implementation of the Convention (Recommendation 2/1 paragraph 1(c)).

The second issue is of relevance not only to this agenda item but also to agenda item 4.14 (Operations of the Convention) in relation to the future calendar of meetings.

5. In the same recommendation, the Working Group requested the Executive Secretary to invite Parties to submit views on the revision of the Strategic Plan beyond 2010, and to prepare a report for the ninth meeting of the Conference of the Parties, taking into account also the views expressed by Parties at the second meeting of the Working Group on Review of Implementation of the Convention. Such a report is provided in UNEP/CBD/COP/9/14/Add.1.

6. The present document provides an overview of the implementation of the Strategic Plan of the Convention (section II) and progress towards the 2010 target (section III). It builds upon the analysis prepared for the second edition of the Global Environment Outlook and the second meeting of the Working Group on Review of Implementation of the Convention, <sup>\*/</sup> in particular the summary of the outcome of the in depth review as reviewed by WGRI-2 (reproduced in section II A below), with information updated in light of more recent information, including that provided through the regional and subregional workshops on national biodiversity strategies and action plans (NBSAPs) and biodiversity mainstreaming (section II B below).

## II. PROGRESS IN THE IMPLEMENTATION OF STRATEGIC PLAN

7. The assessment of progress towards the goals and objectives of the Strategic Plan prepared for the first meeting of the Working Group on Review of Implementation of the Convention (UNEP/CBD/WGRI/1/2) found that relatively good progress was being made towards goal 1 (The Convention is fulfilling its leadership role in international biodiversity issues) and that progress towards goal 4 (There is a better understanding of the importance of biodiversity and of the Convention, and this has led to broader engagement across society in implementation) was mixed. However, in light of poor progress towards goals 2 (Parties have improved financial, human, scientific, technical, and technological capacity to implement the Convention) and 3 (National biodiversity strategies and action plans and the integration of biodiversity concerns into relevant sectors serve as an effective framework for the implementation of the objectives of the Convention), the Working Group recommended an in-depth review be carried out. A summary of the in-depth review of goals 2 and 3 is provided in subsection A below.

8. Regional and subregional capacity-building workshops on national biodiversity strategies and action plans and the mainstreaming of biodiversity carried out to date show that progress has been made in these areas, especially in recent years. A summary of the outcome of the workshops held to date is provided subsection B.

### A. *Summary of the in-depth review of goals 2 and 3 of the Strategic Plan*

9. In its recommendation 2/1, the Working Group on Review of Implementation of the Convention recommended that the Conference of the Parties should take note of the status of implementation of goals

---


<sup>\*/</sup> See UNEP.CBD/WGRI/2/2, UNEP.CBD/WGRI/2/2/Add.2 and the supporting documents referenced therein.

2 and 3 of the Strategic Plan provided in paragraphs (a)-(p) of the summary of the note by the Executive Secretary on the status of implementation of goals 2 and 3 of the Strategic Plan (UNEP/CBD/WG-RI/2/2). This information is reproduced below, with statistics in paragraphs (a) and (b) updated to 24 April 2008, and other updates as indicated by asterisks(\*), in light of information gleaned from the regional and subregional NBSAP workshops (see su-section II B for further information).

(a) One hundred and sixty Parties (84 per cent of the total) have finalized their NBSAPs or equivalent instruments. In addition, seventeen Parties have informed the Secretariat that they are preparing their NBSAP. Thirteen Parties have not prepared an NBSAP or initiated the process to do so, or have not informed the Secretariat that they have done so (see figure 1 and the annex to the present note);

(b) Eighteen Parties have revised NBSAPs, and fourteen more have revisions in progress. Revisions are designed to identify and meet new challenges and to respond to recent guidance from the Conference of the Parties. Some Parties are developing biodiversity strategies and/or action plans at the sub-national level;

*Figure 1: The status of preparation and revision of NBSAPs (April 2008)*



(c) Stakeholder consultations have been a major part of NBSAP preparation. However, the range of stakeholders involved is often not adequate to ensure effective ownership of NBSAPs or to ensure mainstreaming of biodiversity beyond the environment community;

(d) While most NBSAPs include goals and targets few are quantitative and few respond directly to the 2010 biodiversity target or other targets established under the Convention. In part, this results from the fact that most NBSAPs pre-date the establishment of the targets by the Convention on Biological Diversity;

(e) Similarly, reference to the ecosystem approach is absent from most NBSAPs, and most do not include reference to all of the relevant programmes of work and thematic issues under the Convention. However some of the more recently developed NBSAPs incorporate the ecosystem approach\*;

(f) Most NBSAPs include action plans. However, frequently these tend to be focused on projects rather than on the fundamental issues that need to be addressed to achieve the objectives of the Convention. Few specify domestic funding sources;

- (g) Effective communication programmes are lacking from many NBSAPs;
- (h) Most countries report efforts to mainstream biodiversity into sectoral and cross-sectoral policies, plans and programmes. This is probably more effective with some sectors (e.g., forestry, tourism) than others. Mainstreaming in national development and poverty reduction strategies and broader planning processes appears to be generally weak. However, there have been significant advances in this respect in recent years\*;
- (i) Most countries have identified priorities for implementation of their NBSAPs, but few of them have indicated in their national reports whether and to what extent they have been implemented. Some countries may have comprehensive reports on implementation but these are not systematically available to the Secretariat;
- (j) Parties report that the most widespread constraints to implementation of the Convention are “lack of financial, human and technical resources” and “lack of economic incentive measures”. Articles 7, 12, 8(h) and 8(a)-(e) are reported to be the provisions most constrained by lack of resources;
- (k) While nearly all countries indicate that they provide some financial support or incentives to national activities that are intended to achieve the objectives of the Convention, budget cuts are a serious problem in some countries. There are many examples of private contributions and resources generated from revenue measures, but the resources are generally small at national or international levels;
- (l) Several countries have begun to introduce innovative financial mechanisms such as payments for ecosystem services, but, generally speaking, they have not yet borne fruit in generating sustainable financing. About one third of the reporting countries have adopted tax-exemption status for biodiversity-related donations
- (m) Most countries do not have a process to monitor financial support in their countries, and only one fifth of reporting countries have conducted a review of how their national budgets (including official development assistance) support of national biodiversity activities;
- (n) According to data from the Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD) about US\$ 9 billion dollars of biodiversity-related donor assistance have been provided for the period 1998–2005. No clear long term trends in bilateral assistance can be discerned;
- (o) While some positive outcomes are reported for specific activities, in general, technology transfer and cooperation under the Convention appears to have been very limited;
- (p) Important progress has been made with respect to the exchange of information and scientific and technical cooperation in general. However, the overall role of the clearing-house mechanism in supporting such cooperation needs to be further elaborated. About one half of the Parties have developed a national clearing-house mechanism.

**B. Summary of the outcome of the workshops on NBSAPs and biodiversity mainstreaming.**

10. Further to decision VIII/8, the Secretariat is organizing, in cooperation with host countries, donors and partner organizations, a series of regional and sub-regional capacity building workshops on national biodiversity strategies and action plans and the mainstreaming of biodiversity. The workshops are being held throughout 2008 along the lines set out in document UNEP.CBD/WGRI/2/INF/2, which was presented for information at the second meeting of the Working Group on Review of Implementation. Five workshops will be held before the ninth meeting of the Conference of the Parties. This section is based on the outcome of the first four workshops, for South, East and South-east Asia (Singapore, January, 2008), Southern and Eastern Africa (South Africa 4-7 February, 2008), Mesoamerica (Mexico, 26-27 March 2008), and South America (Brazil, 31 March – 4 April). In total, 54 Parties participated in these four workshops. Information from an additional workshop for Europe (Germany, 26-30 April 2008), as well as others scheduled to take place after the ninth meeting of the Conference of the Parties will be included as this synthesis is being updated and made available at the

website for the workshops. †/ Information on targeted workshops, such as that on the development of national/regional biodiversity-related targets and indicators and their integration in national biodiversity strategies and action plans, held in Rome on 16 February 2008, is also being made available on this website.

11. Participants in the workshops comprised officials responsible for the development and/or implementation of NBSAPs, nominated by national focal points for the Convention, as well as a number of experts in mainstreaming of biodiversity and in communication, education and public awareness. At all three workshops held to date, participants welcomed the opportunity, for the first time in meetings under the Convention, to discuss progress in developing, updating and implementing NBSAPs and biodiversity mainstreaming and to exchange experiences among countries in the respective regions and subregions. Evaluations were carried out at the end of each workshop and these were generally highly positive.

12. In addition to building capacity through mutual learning and training, the workshops provided information on the status of NBSAPs and on mainstreaming which supplements and updates the desk-based analysis presented to the second meeting of the Working Group on Review of Implementation (see UNEP/CBD/WGRI/2/2 and documents referred to therein). The following paragraphs outline the main conclusions of the first four workshops in this regard:

(a) National biodiversity strategies and action plans (NBSAPs) have provided a useful framework for implementation of the Convention in countries. While many countries already had conservation-oriented laws and programmes before the Convention on Biological Diversity came into force, most have found that NBSAPs provide a useful framework for a broader range of actions corresponding to the three objectives of the Convention. In many countries NBSAPs have promoted the development of additional laws and programmes, and have catalysed action in a broader range of issues such as: invasive alien species (beyond those already addressed through plant protection services in the agricultural and forest sectors); sustainable use; incentive measures, protection of traditional knowledge; access and benefit sharing; biosafety; and agricultural biodiversity. Newer NBSAPs have also addressed additional issues. In Asia, these include: linking protected areas through ecological corridors (e.g., Bhutan), climate change (e.g., Japan, Thailand), the impact on biodiversity of other countries through imports of food and timber (e.g., Japan), avian flu, biofuels and incentive measures (Thailand);

(b) Recently developed and updated NBSAPs tend to be more strategic than the first generation of NBSAPs and they have a stronger emphasis on biodiversity mainstreaming. Thus, there appears to have been an evolution in the scope and strategic focus of NBSAPs; while many early NBSAPs included lists of activities and of (largely unfunded) project proposals, more recent ones place emphasis on the key policy and institutional changes required for biodiversity conservation and sustainable use. Some also have a greater emphasis on capacity building and institutional arrangements (e.g., Thailand, Indonesia). Some newer plans contain goals and targets, (e.g., Indonesia, Philippines, China). However NBSAPs with quantitative targets or targets that are closely linked to the 2010 Biodiversity Target (e.g., Brazil, South Africa), are still in a minority;

(c) As was emphasized at the African workshop, to be effective, NBSAPs must reflect broader national development and environment objectives. For example, the Namibian NBSAP is positioned as contribution to national development and Vision 2030, and the Madagascan NBSAP was updated to align it with the priorities of the Madagascar Action Plan which sets out the overall vision of the Government. In general, newer NBSAPs tend to be more closely linked to the cycle of national planning processes such as five-year plans (e.g., Indonesia, Malaysia, Thailand), poverty reduction plans (Cambodia, Madagascar, Viet Nam), the framework for achievement of the Millennium Development Goals (Cambodia), sectoral ministry master plans (Cambodia), and development plans (Namibia, Philippines);

(d) Three broad types or approaches to mainstreaming can be identified: integration of biodiversity into economic sectors; integration into cross-sectoral policies and strategies (finance, national

---

†/ <http://www.cbd.int/nbsap/workshops.shtml>

development, poverty eradication); and integration into spatial planning, especially at provincial/state and municipal levels. In Asia, it was considered that, to date, there has been good or significant progress with some sectoral ministries such as agriculture, forestry, and tourism and that there is potential to expand to other sectors (such as health and education). There has been less attention to integration into cross-sectoral policies and strategies (although, as noted above, this is greater in more recent NBSAPs).

(e) There is much potential for integrating biodiversity into spatial planning. There is much potential to integrate biodiversity in Spatial Planning. Brazil has promoted Ecological-Economical Zoning processes at multiple scales (federal, state, Acre municipal, river basin). South Africa has carried out a national spatial assessment of biodiversity and is integrating biodiversity into spatial planning and economic development in North West and Western Cape Provinces (South Africa);

(f) Recently developed national biodiversity strategies and action plans tend to give greater emphasis to biodiversity planning at the sub-national level (state/provincial and local/district). In some countries, this is in line with programmes of decentralization and/or increased regional autonomy (e.g., in Indonesia, China, Pakistan). Some federal countries have promoted the development of state or provincial biodiversity strategies and action plans (e.g., India, which has 71 strategies and action plans representing local, state, ecoregional, and thematic levels; Mexico where State Biodiversity Strategies have been adopted by Michoacán and Morales and are in preparation for another 8 states). Additionally, Peru has developed 17 “regional biodiversity strategies” as biodiversity planning instruments. Uganda has emphasized implementation at the district level;

(g) Integration of biodiversity into other sectors is easier if the NBSAPs is developed in a truly cross-sectoral manner in the first place (e.g., Maldives). It can also be facilitated if a body other than the environment department leads the process. (For example, in Indonesia the planning authority (BAPPENAS) led the development of the NBSAP and this later facilitated the incorporation of the NBSAP into the Medium Term Development Plan.) Some other interesting examples of mainstreaming include: the integration of biodiversity into district planning in Senoi district, Madhra Pradesh, India; the integration of biodiversity into the National Physical Plan (for spatial planning) in peninsular Malaysia); and the integration of biodiversity into urban planning in Singapore;

(h) The need for wide stakeholder participation in the development and implementation of NBSAPs is widely understood. Engagement of local and indigenous communities is particularly crucial. In Southern Africa community-based natural resource management is emphasized (e.g., in Namibia). In Mexico and Central America there are numerous examples of successful community based forest management, many of which are linked to the Mesoamerican Biological Corridor. Community driven examples of sustainable use of biodiversity supported by the best available science can have a powerful effect on policy as well as providing a model for others. However, there are challenges in scaling up such activities;

(i) The use of economic instruments is seen as an important—but under-used—approach to mainstream biodiversity. There are several examples in Mexico of payment for ecosystem services. China is exploring approaches to “eco-compensation”;

(j) Regional mechanisms (such as the Central American Commission for Environment and Development (CCAD) for Mesoamerica) play an important role in supporting NBSAP development and implementation;

(k) The need for effective monitoring and evaluation of the implementation of NBSAPs was emphasized at the workshops, and more recently developed NBSAPs tend to give more emphasis to these aspects and also to use adaptive management. (For example, in its revised national biodiversity strategy and action plan, Cambodia addresses what happens in absence of implementation of each action). The use of a framework such as that provided in the annex to decision VIII/8 was recommended;

(l) The importance of communication is widely recognized, but few programmes are in place to implement this effectively;

(m) While some countries have a national clearing-house mechanisms (e.g., Brazil, China, Colombia, Costa Rica, India, Indonesia, Japan, Malaysia, Mexico, Peru, Singapore, Thailand), national clearing-house mechanism nodes are generally poorly developed. The role of the clearing-house mechanism in facilitating communication among stakeholders and supporting mainstreaming is particularly limited.

## II. FOLLOW-UP ACTIVITIES REQUIRED

13. Many countries have prepared guidelines, training materials, reports on implementation, and success stories which could also be useful to other countries. Participants to the workshop committed themselves to do more to share information and experiences within and among countries. Many committed themselves to preparing posters on NBSAPs for display at the ninth meeting of the Conference of the Parties, and to ensure that their fourth national reports would be prepared on time. They also called upon the Secretariat and partner organizations, including regional bodies, as well as Parties that already have established capacity in this regard, to enhance the role of the clearing-house mechanism in this respect, and to provide support to enhance national nodes of the clearing-house mechanism. To date, the clearing-house mechanism has played a limited role in facilitating the sharing of this information for its wider use. The note by the Executive Secretary on proposals for the implementation of the strategic plan of the clearing-house mechanism under the Convention (UNEP/CBD/COP/9/23) sets out the Secretariat's proposals to enhance the role of the clearing-house mechanism in this regard.

14. The need for continued and enhanced support from the financial mechanism for the development, updating and implementation of NBSAPs, including support for the country studies or assessments where needed, was highlighted.

15. The Secretariat and partner organizations were also requested to further develop training materials on how to develop and update NBSAPs, and in particular on mainstreaming. Many participating countries called for a continued programme of workshops to strengthen capacity in countries through mutual learning and training. The workshops showed a clear demand for enhanced support for capacity building and technical assistance from the secretariat and from regional and international organizations.

## III. PROGRESS TOWARDS THE 2010 BIODIVERSITY TARGET.

16. The second edition of Global Biodiversity Outlook (GBO-2), published in 2006, provided an account of the status and trends of biodiversity <sup>¶</sup>, using the indicators identified by the Conference of the Parties (decisions VII/30 and VIII/15) <sup>§</sup> and building upon the findings of the Millennium Ecosystem Assessment.

17. All but one of the indicators used in GBO-2 showed declining trends for biodiversity, and, as noted in GBO-2, the Millennium Ecosystem Assessment concluded that unprecedented additional actions would be needed to achieve the 2010 target at all levels. The GBO-2 also provided an assessment of the prospects for achieving the 21 sub-targets of the framework for assessing progress towards the 2010

---

<sup>¶</sup> The trends in biodiversity, according to the indicators, is summarized in Table 2.1 of GBO-2, available at [www.cbd.int/gbo2](http://www.cbd.int/gbo2)

<sup>§</sup> *Progress in the development of indicators.* The second edition of Global Biodiversity Outlook, published in 2006, was the first report on current trends in biodiversity applying the indicators contained the framework for assessing progress towards the Strategic Plan (decisions VII/30 and VIII/15). Based on available information at that time eight of the indicators were considered to be of good quality. Since then, the 2010 Biodiversity Indicators Partnership ([www.twentyten.net](http://www.twentyten.net)) has been launched (at the margins of the second meeting of the Working Group on Review of Implementation) and the fifth meeting of the Working Group on Article 8(j) and related provisions has considered a list of possible indicators contained in the report of the International Experts Seminar on Indicators Relevant for Indigenous Peoples, the Convention on Biological Diversity and the Millennium Development Goals and recommended that a maximum of two additional indicators on the status of traditional knowledge, innovations and practices are selected for inclusion into the framework by the Ad Hoc Working Group on Article 8(j) and Related Provisions at its sixth meeting. Progress is being made by members of the 2010 Biodiversity Indicators Partnership on those indicators for which further work on methodology and/or data coverage (geographical and/or temporal) is required progress with a view to providing a comprehensive picture of the change in the rate of biodiversity loss in the third edition of Global Biodiversity Outlook.

Biodiversity Targets adopted by decisions VII/30 and VIII/15. <sup>\*\*/</sup> This assessment showed mixed prospects; some targets were considered challenging but achievable, while others were considered to be probably unachievable by 2010.

18. While it is not appropriate or possible to provide a comprehensive update of the assessments provided by the GBO-2 or the MA at this stage, at a global level, there does not appear to be evidence of a reversal or slowing down of the negative trends described in these reports. Indeed, the two indicators for which there is updated data <sup>††/</sup> available show continuing negative trends. Moreover many of the drivers of biodiversity loss appear to be increasing in intensity: the Fourth Assessment Report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) and other recent scientific studies show that climate change is now considered to be a greater threat to biodiversity than was the case when the MA and GBO-2 were prepared; reports indicate a continuing worsening status of fisheries and marine ecosystems; and incentives from mainly developed countries for greater use of biofuels has added to pressures for land use change. Nevertheless a number of countries are taking action to reduce biodiversity loss. In particular there is continued progress in improving the coverage, representativity and effectiveness of protected areas, although coverage of marine protected areas still lags behind.

19. A comprehensive update of the status and trends of biodiversity, and progress towards the 2010 Biodiversity Target will be provided in the third edition of the Global Biodiversity Outlook which is being prepared in line with the plans set out in the note by the Executive Secretary on the subject (UNEP/CBD/COP/9/15), in line with guidance from the Conference of the Parties and SBSTTA.

---

<sup>\*\*/</sup> Table 4.1 of in the second edition of the Global Biodiversity Outlook provides prospects for achieving the targets of the framework for assessing progress towards the 2010 biodiversity target.

<sup>††/</sup> Trends in abundance and distribution of selected species: Living Planet Index (data in GBO-2 up to 2000, now up to 2003). Ecological footprint and related concepts: Ecological Footprint (previously up to 2000, now up to 2003).

*Annex***STATUS OF DEVELOPMENT OF NATIONAL BIODIVERSITY STRATEGIES AND ACTION PLANS OR EQUIVALENT INSTRUMENTS (NBSAPS) AT 24 APRIL 2008****A. Parties that have revised NBSAPs**

(dates refer to completion of each NBSAP)

1. Austria (1998, 2005)
2. Bhutan (1997, 2002)
3. Botswana (2005, 2007)
4. Brazil (2002, 2006)
5. Cuba (1997, 2006)
6. European Community (1998, 2006)
7. Finland (1997, 2006)
8. Indonesia (1993, 2003)
9. Japan (1995, 2002, 2008)
10. Madagascar (2000, 2007)
11. Morocco (2002, 2004)
12. Netherlands (1995, 2001)
13. Philippines (1997, 2002)
14. Singapore (1992, 2002)
15. Sweden (1995, 2006)
16. Thailand (1997, 2002)
17. United Kingdom (1994, 2006)
18. Vietnam (1994, 2007)

**B. Parties with NBSAPs under revision**

(date refers to existing NBSAP)

1. Australia (1996)
2. Bahamas (1999)
3. China (1993)
4. Estonia (1999)
5. Guinea (2001)
6. India (1999)
7. Ireland (2002)
8. Lebanon (1998)
9. New Zealand (2000)
10. Qatar (2004)
11. Romania (1996)
12. Spain (1999) \*Strategy only
13. Tunisia (1998)
14. Turkmenistan (2002)

**C. Other Parties with completed NBSAPs**

(date refers to completion)

1. Albania (1999)
2. Algeria (2005)
3. Angola (2006)
4. Argentina (2003)
5. Armenia (1999)
6. Azerbaijan (2004)
7. Bahrain (2007)
8. Bangladesh (2006)
9. Barbados (2002)
10. Belarus (1997)
11. Belize (1998)
12. Belgium (2007)
13. Benin (2002)

14. Bolivia (2001)
15. Burkina Faso (1998)
16. Bulgaria (2000) \* Action Plan only
17. Burundi (2000)
18. Cambodia (2002)
19. Cameroon (1999)
20. Canada (1996)
21. Cape Verde (1999)
22. Central African Republic (2000)
23. Chad (1999)
24. Chile (2003)
25. Colombia (2005)
26. Comoros (2000)
27. Congo (2001)
28. Cook Islands (2001)
29. Costa Rica (1999)
30. Côte d'Ivoire (2002) \*Strategy only
31. Croatia (1999)
32. Czech Republic (2005)
33. DR Congo (1999)
34. DPR Korea (1998)
35. Denmark (1996)
36. Djibouti (2001)
37. Dominica (2000)
38. Ecuador (2001)
39. Egypt (1998)
40. El Salvador (1999)
41. Eritrea (2000)
42. Ethiopia (2006)
43. Fiji (1997)
44. France (2004) \*Strategy only
45. Gabon (1999)
46. Gambia (1999)
47. Georgia (2005)
48. Germany (2007)
49. Ghana (2002) \*Strategy only
50. Grenada (2000)
51. Guatemala (1999)
52. Guinea-Bissau (2006)
53. Guyana (1999)
54. Honduras (2001)
55. Hungary (2004)
56. Iran (2006)
57. Jamaica (2003)
58. Jordan (2001)
59. Kazakhstan (1999)
60. Kenya (1999)
61. Kiribati (2006)
62. Kyrgyzstan (1998)
63. Lao PDR (2004)
64. Latvia (2000)
65. Lesotho (2004)

66. Liberia (2003)
  67. Lithuania (1996)
  68. Malawi (2006)
  69. Malaysia (1998)
  70. Maldives (2002)
  71. Mali (2001)
  72. Marshall Islands (2000)
  73. Mauritania (1999)
  74. Mauritius (2006)
  75. Mexico (2000)
  76. Micronesia, Federated States of (2002)
  77. Mongolia (1996)
  78. Mozambique (2001)
  79. Namibia (2002)
  80. Nepal (2002)
  81. Nicaragua (2001)
  82. Niger (1998)
  83. Nigeria (2006)
  84. Niue (2001)
  85. Norway (2001)
  86. Oman (2001)
  87. Pakistan (1999)
  88. Palau (2005)
  89. Panama (2000)
  90. Papua New Guinea (2007)
  91. Paraguay (2003)
  92. Peru (2001)
  93. Poland (2003)
  94. Portugal (2001)
  95. Republic of Korea (1997)
  96. Republic of Moldova (2000)
  97. Russian Federation (2001)
  98. Rwanda (2003)
  99. Saint Lucia (2000)
  100. Samoa (2001)
  101. Sao Tome and Principe (2005)
  102. Senegal (1998)
  103. Seychelles (1997)
  104. Sierra Leone (2003)
  105. Slovakia (1998)
  106. Slovenia (2001)
  107. South Africa (2005)
  108. Sri Lanka (1998)
  109. Sudan (2000)
  110. Suriname (2006) \*Strategy only
  111. Swaziland (2001)
  112. Switzerland (2006)
  113. Syrian Arab Republic (2002)
  114. Tajikistan (2003)
  115. The former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, (2005)
  116. Togo (2003)
  117. Tonga (2006)
  118. Trinidad and Tobago (2001)
  119. Uganda (2002)
  120. Ukraine (1998) \*Strategy only
  121. United Republic of Tanzania (2004)
  122. Uruguay (1999)
  123. Uzbekistan (1998)
  124. Venezuela (2001)
  125. Vanuatu (1999)
  126. Yemen (2005)
  127. Zambia (2003)
  128. Zimbabwe (2000)
- D. Parties with first NBSAP under development**
1. Antigua and Barbuda
  2. Bosnia and Herzegovina
  3. Dominican Republic
  4. Greece
  5. Iceland
  6. Italy
  7. Israel
  8. Malta
  9. Monaco
  10. Myanmar
  11. Saint Vincent and the Grenadines
  12. Saudi Arabia
  13. Solomon Islands
  14. Serbia
  15. Timor-Leste
  16. Turkey
  17. Tuvalu
- E. Parties for which there is no information about the status of NBSAPs.**
1. Afghanistan
  2. Cyprus
  3. Equatorial Guinea
  4. Haiti
  5. Kuwait
  6. Libyan Arab Jamahiriya
  7. Liechtenstein
  8. Luxembourg
  9. Montenegro
  10. Nauru
  11. Saint Kitts and Nevis
  12. San Marino
  13. United Arab Emirates

-----