



Convention on Biological Diversity

Distr.: General
25 September 2024

English only

Dialogue in the Republic of Moldova on national biodiversity strategies and action plans

Chisinau, 9–11 September 2024

Report of the dialogue in the Republic of Moldova on national biodiversity strategies and action plans

Introduction

1. By its decision [15/4](#), the Conference of the Parties to the Convention on Biological Diversity adopted the Kunming-Montreal Global Biodiversity Framework and noted that its implementation would be supported by decisions [15/5](#), [15/6](#), [15/7](#), [15/8](#), [15/9](#) and [15/13](#), which it affirmed to be of equal standing in relation to the Framework. The Conference of the Parties noted that the implementation of the Framework would be supported by relevant decisions adopted by the Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety and the Nagoya Protocol on Access to Genetic Resources and the Fair and Equitable Sharing of Benefits Arising from their Utilization, in particular the Implementation Plan for the Cartagena Protocol and the Capacity-building Action Plan for the Cartagena Protocol.¹
2. By its decision [15/6](#), the Conference of the Parties to the Convention adopted an enhanced multidimensional approach to planning, monitoring, reporting and review, with national biodiversity strategies and action plans, revised or updated in alignment with the Framework and its goals and targets, as the main vehicle for the implementation of the Framework. In the same decision, the Conference of the Parties requested Parties to revise and update their national biodiversity strategies and action plans, aligned with the Framework and its goals and targets, and submit them by its sixteenth meeting. In decision [15/7](#), the Conference of the Parties encouraged Parties to develop, update and implement national biodiversity finance plans or similar instruments on the basis of the national biodiversity strategies and action plans. In decision [15/8](#), the Conference of the Parties urged Parties to integrate capacity-building and development components in their national biodiversity strategies and action plans, while updating them in line with the Framework, and/or develop dedicated biodiversity capacity-building and development action plans, and programmes, as appropriate.
3. In decision [15/6](#), the Conference of the Parties requested the Executive Secretary to support the operationalization of the enhanced multidimensional approach to planning, monitoring, reporting and review, including by collaborating with relevant partners to provide necessary capacity-building and other support and supporting the Subsidiary Body on Implementation in the further development and piloting of a modus operandi of an open-ended forum for the voluntary country review of implementation. In decision [15/8](#), the Conference of the Parties requested the Executive Secretary to support and advise Parties on ways to integrate capacity-building and development components into their national biodiversity strategies and action plans.

¹ Decisions [CP-10/3](#), annex, and [CP-10/4](#), annex, respectively.

4. With generous funding from the Government of Japan, provided through the Japan Biodiversity Fund, and the Department for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, the Government of Denmark and the European Union, the Secretariat supported the overall organization of a series of regional or subregional dialogues in 2023 and 2024 aimed at facilitating the sharing of experiences and mutual learning related to the revision or updating of national biodiversity strategies and action plans in alignment with the Framework, including by setting and aligning national targets with the Framework. The dialogues have been organized at the regional or subregional level with the support of specific partners and donors identified for each dialogue.

5. With the support of the Ministry of the Environment of the Republic of Moldova, the present dialogue was held in Chisinau from 9 to 11 September 2024. Representatives of Parties, relevant United Nations and regional and subregional organizations and stakeholder groups were invited to attend. The dialogue provided participants with an opportunity to share experiences and lessons learned in the revision or updating of national biodiversity strategies and action plans, including good practices and ways and means for addressing challenges in that regard, and contributed to the further piloting of the open-ended forum for the voluntary country review of implementation, under the Subsidiary Body on Implementation, as requested in decision [15/6](#). The dialogue included breakout sessions on capacity-building and development and national biodiversity financing, which fed into the overall discussion. The discussions were aimed at addressing challenges that countries are facing and identifying possible opportunities and solutions that will enhance the overall development and implementation of national biodiversity strategies and action plans.

Item 1

Opening of the meeting

6. The dialogue was opened at 10 a.m. on 9 September. Sergiu Lazarencu, Minister of the Environment of the Republic of Moldova, provided opening remarks and a video recorded address by the Executive Secretary of the Convention, Astrid Schomaker, was presented at the opening of the dialogue.

7. Mr. Lazarencu welcomed the participants to the Republic of Moldova. He highlighted the progress that the country had made in aligning its biodiversity goals with the Kunming-Montreal Global Biodiversity Framework and the European Green Deal. The national development strategy, entitled "Moldova Europeana 2030", and the updated environmental strategy 2024-2030 emphasize forest expansion, sustainable development and increasing protected natural areas as key issues. The national biodiversity strategy and action plan is being updated to align with national targets which have been developed and submitted to the Secretariat. Further, the Republic of Moldova is committed to further integration with European Union environmental policies, including with the Natura 2000 network.

8. Ms. Schomaker shared her thanks to all participants for joining the meeting in person and remotely. She highlighted the ambitious goals of shaping the world we want by 2050, including the targets of protecting 30 per cent of the planet by 2030 and mobilizing 30 billion United States dollars annually, and stressed the urgent need to convert plans into actionable steps, revise national strategies and develop capacity and financing plans. Ms. Schomaker reflected on the value of enhanced synergies with other Rio conventions and multilateral environmental agreements and encouraged the sharing of best practices. She emphasized the importance of setting and updating national targets and national biodiversity strategies and action plans before the sixteenth meeting of the Conference of the Parties to the Convention in Colombia. Ms. Schomaker noted that a number of countries had already submitted national targets and urged others to submit their national targets as soon as possible.

Item 2

Introduction and overview of the objectives and programme of the dialogue

9. A representative of the Secretariat presented the objectives of the dialogue and the proposed organization of work. Participants were invited to briefly introduce themselves.

10. To contextualize the dialogue, the Secretariat provided an introduction to the Framework and associated decisions adopted at the fifteenth meeting of the Conference of the Parties to the Convention, the tenth meeting of the Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Cartagena Protocol and the fourth meeting of the Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Nagoya Protocol. The Secretariat noted that in its decision 15/6, the Conference of the Parties adopted an enhanced planning, monitoring, reporting and review mechanism, with a view to strengthening the implementation of the Convention, building on the existing multidimensional review approaches. In the same decision, national biodiversity strategies and action plans were reaffirmed as the main instruments for the implementation of the Convention and the Framework at the national level.

11. The Secretariat presented the objectives and programme of the dialogue. It was noted that the dialogue aimed towards: (a) providing countries with an opportunity to exchange experiences and lessons learned in the revision or updating of national biodiversity strategies and action plans; (b) addressing common challenges faced by countries and identifying possible solutions and opportunities; and (c) contributing to the continued piloting of an open-ended forum for voluntary country reviews of implementation under the Subsidiary Body on Implementation. The organization of work and the format for the dialogue, which comprised a mix of introductory presentations, presentations by countries and organizations, and facilitated plenary and group discussions, were presented.

Item 3

Experiences and lessons learned in revising or updating national biodiversity strategies and action plans, including national targets

12. The discussion during this part of the dialogue was organized around five sessions under five different topics. The overall findings emerging from the discussions were discussed and agreed at the end of the session. The different sessions are described in the present section of this report and the conclusions are presented under item 5 below and in the annex to the present report.

(a) *The whole-of-government and whole-of-society approach*

13. The session on the whole-of-government and whole-of-society approach included presentations delivered by countries that are parties to the Convention and stakeholders, which were followed by group discussions. Some of the key messages from the presentations are summarized below. Key points emerging from the group discussions are summarized in the conclusions contained in the annex. A representative of the Secretariat delivered an introductory presentation on the guidance for revising or updating national biodiversity strategies and action plans contained in annex I to decision 15/6 of the Conference of the Parties. All updated national biodiversity strategies and action plans should contain the following three elements: (a) national targets aligned with the Framework; (b) actions or programmes developed to implement the national targets; and (c) monitoring and evaluation of the implementation of the national biodiversity strategy and action plan, including the use of headline indicators. The representative emphasized that the revised or updated national biodiversity strategy and action plan needed to include means of implementation and needed to be adopted as a policy or legal instrument to ensure its implementation by all actors and that the revision or updating process should not interrupt the implementation of the national biodiversity strategy and action plan. The presentation served as an introduction to this session and the session on national target setting.

14. A representative of Poland gave a presentation on the country's whole-of-government and whole-of-society approach to its national biodiversity strategy and action plan. The involvement of

diverse stakeholders, ensuring broad participation, was emphasized. Those stakeholders included central and local government bodies, scientific units, businesses and non-governmental organizations. In Poland, institutional arrangements rely on intergovernmental coordination, legal frameworks and public participation to enhance acceptance and implementation. Poland has already conducted interministerial consultations and workshops and plans to hold nationwide public consultations and further government reviews. Recommendations include early stakeholder involvement, clear communication and modern tools such as online surveys to improve engagement during implementation, monitoring and reporting. The representative of Poland shared the following observation: while the country's national targets are mostly completed, the process for adopting and submitting those targets takes time.

15. A representative of the Global Youth Biodiversity Network emphasized the importance of a whole-of-society approach, with a special focus on youth inclusion, in the development of national biodiversity strategies and action plans. Youth should be recognized not only as beneficiaries but also as leaders, partners and decision makers in the context of biodiversity policy and implementation. The findings of a 2022 review of national biodiversity strategies and action plans were highlighted. They demonstrated limited youth engagement and therefore a need for a greater number of youth-related indicators, disaggregated data and transformative education. Challenges include lack of information, resource constraints and methodologies that do not cater to youth-friendly consultations. Recommendations include increasing youth participation, building capacity and involving diverse groups, including indigenous peoples, in the development and implementation of national biodiversity strategies and action plans.

16. A representative of Hungary outlined the country's national biodiversity strategy for 2030 which covers four main areas: engagement, structures/processes of involvement, lessons learned/challenges and implementation. The strategy emphasizes the importance of engaging various sectors and ministries, establishing working groups and conducting interministerial consultations. Key challenges include diversity of views, financial needs and the difficulties of obtaining approvals. The added value of increased awareness and involvement across government and society was stressed. Implementation plans in Hungary include a midterm evaluation in 2025.

17. A representative of North Macedonia explained that the country is at the beginning of the process of updating and revising the national biodiversity strategy and action plan and outlined the process envisioned. The representative shared information regarding the country's difficulty in initiating the Global Environment Facility (GEF) Early Action Support project which has slowed down the development of the national biodiversity strategy and action plan substantially.

(b) *Integration of the provisions of the Protocols and of other biodiversity-related agreements into national biodiversity strategies and action plans*

18. The session on the integration of the provisions of the Protocols and of other biodiversity-related agreements into national biodiversity strategies and action plans included country presentations, which were followed by discussions held in plenary. Some of the key messages emerging from the presentations are summarized below and in the conclusions contained in the annex to this report.

19. A representative of the Secretariat gave a presentation on the integration of the Protocols into national biodiversity strategies and action plans. She emphasized the importance of national biodiversity strategies and action plans that integrate the Convention and its Protocols, noting that those instruments contribute jointly to the implementation of the three objectives of the Convention which are interdependent and mutually supportive. She noted that the need for a more balanced approach to implementing the Convention and its Protocols had been reinforced by the inclusion of Goal C and Targets 13 and 17 in the Framework. Targets 13 and 17 can be used as entry points for integrating the Protocols into the national biodiversity strategy and action plan. Some of the benefits of integration include cost savings and increased efficiency through integrated implementation. Moving forward, Parties were invited to ensure that their Protocol focal points were included in the

national target setting and national biodiversity strategy and action plan revision processes to ensure that Targets 13 and 17 and Protocol-related considerations were adequately addressed.

20. A representative of the Republic of Moldova gave a presentation on the country's efforts to integrate the Protocols and multilateral environmental agreements into the national biodiversity strategy and action plan. Legislative updates were highlighted, such as the new law on genetically modified organisms, and the establishment of various commissions and regulations to manage the issues of genetically modified organisms and biosafety. Specific objectives and actions for biodiversity conservation were outlined, including promoting agriculture without genetically modified organisms, reversing genetic diversity erosion and ensuring fair benefit-sharing from the use of genetic resources. The development of biosecurity frameworks, risk assessment procedures and public awareness initiatives to strengthen the management of invasive alien species and living modified organisms was explained. The country has faced several challenges, including:

(a) Diverse views and interests: balancing the diverse views and interests of various stakeholders, including government agencies, private businesses, non-governmental organizations and local communities, has been a complex endeavour;

(b) Financial constraints: securing adequate financial resources for implementing biosecurity and biodiversity measures has been a significant hurdle;

(c) Regulatory and institutional frameworks: developing and strengthening the necessary legal and institutional frameworks for effective biosecurity and regulation of genetically modified organisms have been challenging;

(d) Public awareness and education: increasing public awareness and understanding of biosecurity issues, including the risks associated with invasive alien species and genetically modified organisms, requires continuous effort;

(e) Technical and human resources: ensuring that there are sufficient technical and human resources to implement and monitor biosecurity measures effectively is challenging;

(f) Approval processes: the approval process for new regulations and measures can be slow and complicated, hindering timely implementation;

(g) Coordination among agencies: effective coordination among various government agencies and stakeholders is essential but often difficult to achieve.

21. These challenges highlight the need for ongoing efforts to improve financial support, regulatory frameworks, public engagement and inter-agency coordination to successfully integrate the Protocols into the biodiversity strategy of the Republic of Moldova.

22. A representative of Georgia outlined the country's efforts to integrate international environmental agreements and the Protocols into the national biodiversity strategy and action plan. Although Georgia has not yet ratified the Nagoya Protocol, it has laid a legal foundation for future ratification. Challenges such as insufficient sector-specific actions and monitoring were highlighted, while improvements through the adoption of laws on genetically modified organisms, equipped laboratories and control systems were emphasized. Opportunities to enhance the implementation of the Framework were identified, including through stakeholder involvement, awareness campaigns and the formation of a steering committee.

23. A representative of Armenia highlighted the rich biodiversity of the country, with its range of endemic species and species listed in the International Union for Conservation of Nature Red List of Threatened Species, alongside its efforts to regulate the use and protection of wild animals. The plans of Armenia to enhance its legal and institutional frameworks for biodiversity protection, including revisions to laws on genetically modified organisms and biosafety, were discussed in the presentation. Moreover, the Government aims to align its national biodiversity strategy and action plan with the Framework through improved monitoring, policy coherence and financing initiatives. Information on seminars on biosafety and efforts to improve biodiversity protection was provided.

24. A representative of Slovakia reported that the Protocol targets as well as recognition of the biodiversity beyond national jurisdiction processes are already included in the country's national biodiversity strategy and action plan. Slovakia is a party to both Protocols and as a member of the European Union, Slovakia follows its guidance related to regulation of genetically modified organisms. The representative highlighted the fact that, while the national biodiversity strategy and action plan had been developed through an active working group on biodiversity, there was a need to engage additional stakeholders, including stakeholders related to the Protocols.

25. The session on integration of the Protocols concluded with a round-table discussion of experiences within countries which included a tour de table allowing all participants to contribute their specific experiences. The key messages emerging from this discussion are outlined in the annex to this report.

(c) *National target setting or revision*

26. The session on national target setting or revision included country presentations, which were followed by group discussions. Some of the key messages emerging from the presentations are summarized below. Key points from the group discussions are summarized in the conclusions set out in the annex. The session was moderated by the Secretariat, which recalled the introductory presentation in the session on whole-of-government/whole-of-society approaches.

27. A representative of the European Union explained the European Union Biodiversity Strategy for 2030 which uses as a basis its previous plans, including Natura 2000 and the European Green Deal. The strategy uses time-bound targets including restoration and pollution reduction and a new knowledge service. An important component is a nature restoration mechanism including for areas outside of protected areas. The strategies on soil, air, water and forestry are wider than previous strategies and the targets, which have been submitted on the online reporting tool, are relevant to other sectors. While there will be implementation and reporting in 2026 on progress, it has been noted that some gaps in legislation remain. Differing closure dates for programmes is a challenge and the European Union relies on its member States to implement the strategy.

28. A representative of Azerbaijan outlined the 10 policy objectives of the country's national biodiversity strategy and action plan 2025–2030 and the steps undertaken to develop it, including a rapid review of existing national policies related to biodiversity and their alignment with the framework. Twenty-three targets aligned with the Framework were developed and a working group for the project was established to pursue four main activities, including determination of the responsibilities of the interministerial divisions and the duration of those responsibilities. Key objectives under the strategy include enhancing environmental education, improving biodiversity monitoring systems, restoring and conserving biodiversity and ecosystems, expanding protected areas and reducing negative impacts on biodiversity. Moreover, the strategy focuses on improving the regulatory framework, increasing public participation, developing collaborative management and providing adequate resources for conservation efforts. Targets were submitted to the online reporting tool in June 2024.

29. A representative of Bosnia and Herzegovina explained that the country had established a working group of experts for development of the national biodiversity strategy and action plan involving negotiations between agencies. The members of the group are nominated by two separate agencies. Progress has slowed owing to difficulties in initiating the GEF Early Action Support project. Bosnia and Herzegovina decided to focus on Target 19 and the resulting national target which has been developed through a consultative process and submitted through the online reporting tool of the clearing-house mechanism. Experts were engaged to conduct an assessment of the use of nature resources, which will be used as the basis for future strategies on biodiversity reporting. The data were collected using the Intergovernmental Science-Policy Platform on Biodiversity and Ecosystem Services methodology and included societal issues.

30. A representative of Ukraine delivered a presentation on the country's national biodiversity strategy and action plan. The rich biodiversity of Ukraine accounts for 35 per cent of European

biodiversity and encompasses a protected area network which covers almost 7 per cent of the country. The impact on biodiversity of the current war was highlighted, including the damage to protected areas and ecosystems, such as the vast damage due to the large amount of freshwater discharged by the Kakhovka dam. Key priorities of the strategy include halting biodiversity loss, restoring ecosystems, expanding protected areas and improving biodiversity monitoring. Legislative development, public awareness and international cooperation on alignment with global biodiversity frameworks and conventions are emphasized under the strategy. Key laws are being enacted and an inter-agency working group has been developed. The importance of sustainable use and conservation of biodiversity through comprehensive national and international efforts was highlighted. Ukraine is receiving the support of the United Nations Development Programme through the GEF Early Action Support project, whose objectives were outlined.

31. A representative of the International Union for Conservation of Nature Regional Office for Eastern Europe and Central Asia gave a presentation on the alignment of national biodiversity targets in Armenia, Georgia, the Republic of Moldova and Ukraine with the Framework and the European Union Biodiversity Strategy for 2030. The goals of the European Green Deal, which aims for climate neutrality by 2050, and the necessity for those countries to integrate their policies with European Union standards were explained. The targets under the European Union biodiversity strategy were compared with those of national strategies across the aforementioned countries and efforts to protect ecosystems, restore degraded lands, manage invasive species and increase forest cover were discussed in that context. Moreover, specific national goals, challenges and progress in achieving biodiversity protection and ecosystem restoration were highlighted.

32. A representative of the CBD Women's Caucus gave a presentation on the importance of gender-responsive national biodiversity strategies and action plans. The network comprises over 500 organizations which focus on biodiversity conservation, gender equality, youth engagement and the broader socio-economic landscape. The Caucus advocates for a whole-of-government and whole-of-society approach, emphasizing participation, access to information, training and decision-making for women, especially regarding biodiversity policy at national and global levels. Key elements include aligning national targets with the Gender Plan of Action, promoting green jobs and ensuring land rights and access to natural resources. The need for specific funding to support gender transformative initiatives, comprehensive monitoring with sex-disaggregated data and the development of national monitoring plans for the effective implementation of Target 23 under the Framework was stressed.

(d) *Development of a national monitoring plan*

33. The session on development of a national monitoring plan was moderated by the Secretariat and included an introductory presentation provided by the Secretariat, followed by plenary discussions. Key points from the discussions are summarized in the conclusions contained in the annex to this report.

34. The Secretariat introduced the monitoring framework for the Kunming-Montreal Global Biodiversity Framework, adopted at the fifteenth meeting of the Conference of the Parties, including the headline and other indicators for the Framework, and the work undertaken by the Ad Hoc Technical Expert Group on Indicators for the Kunming-Montreal Global Biodiversity Framework, as well as relevant work undertaken by the Subsidiary Body on Scientific, Technical and Technological Advice at its twenty-sixth meeting and the Subsidiary Body on Implementation at its fourth meeting and the ways forward leading to the sixteenth meeting of the Conference of the Parties. The Secretariat moderated a discussion in which participants were asked to describe their progress in developing national monitoring plans. The outcomes are presented in the annex below.

(e) *Challenges and opportunities for the overall revision or updating of national biodiversity strategies and action plans*

35. During this session, the Secretariat presented the findings on the topic thus far and asked participants to consider and reflect upon the main messages.

Item 4**Breakout sessions on capacity-building and development and national biodiversity financing**

36. At its fifteenth meeting, the Conference of the Parties adopted decision [15/7](#) on resource mobilization and decision [15/8](#) on capacity-building and development and technical and scientific cooperation. Those decisions are of equal standing in relation to the Framework and outline the need for capacity-building and development action plans and biodiversity finance plans to accompany national biodiversity strategies and action plans. An overview presentation was delivered by the Secretariat on how the two decisions were related to such strategies and plans.

37. Presentations were given by representatives of the United Nations Environment Programme on the GEF Early Action Support project and by a representative of the NBSAP Accelerator Partnership initiative. The Secretariat delivered a presentation on the capacity assessment process.

38. The remaining discussions conducted in breakout sessions focused on (a) capacity-building and development; and (b) biodiversity finance planning. Participants were invited to join the discussion groups, with one country representative in each group. While some key messages emerging from the discussions are presented in the annex below, the purpose of the exercises was to provide each country with examples to take home and therefore only general findings are included in the annex.

Item 5**Conclusions of the dialogue**

39. Participants discussed and prepared a summary of findings arising from the dialogue, based on the discussions held in both the plenary and the breakout sessions. As noted above, the conclusions are provided in the annex to this report.

Item 6**Closure of the meeting**

40. The meeting closed at 3 p.m. on 11 September 2024, with closing remarks offered by a representative of the Ministry of the Environment of the Republic of Moldova and the Convention Secretariat.

Annex

Key conclusions from the dialogue

I. Whole-of-government and whole-of-society approach

The participants in the dialogue identified the following challenges and good practices:

▪ Challenges

- Many countries have limited experience engaging youth, businesses and other groups
- It is difficult to balance the need for completion of targets against the time required to engage stakeholders
- There is a lack of funding for engaging stakeholders and maintaining their involvement in the implementation process
- While public awareness should be part of each project, communication in a way that the general public can easily understand poses a challenge

▪ Good practices

- Use stakeholder mapping from the previous strategic plan to identify relevant departments, sectors and stakeholders and then identify where gaps exist
- Conduct high-level consultations or conferences to increase awareness and engagement
- Ensure strong engagement in the national biodiversity strategy and action plan process as a means of increasing involvement in implementation
- Find an entry point for attracting interest from the finance or business sector to stimulate future collaboration
- Increase awareness and communication using multiple approaches, such as social media, science panels and online forums
- Leverage political support at the European Union level for the European Union Biodiversity Strategy as an impetus for building national political support
- Secure high-level engagement which is critical
- To address hesitancy or concerns about funding, provide calculations showing that the process has already been mainstreamed, while clarifying that costs are spread across ministries. To reduce concerns about high budget needs, explain that some costs are already included in the sector plans of other ministries, particularly for activities already funded by them

II. Integration of the provisions of the Protocols and of other biodiversity-related agreements into national biodiversity strategies and action plans

The participants in the dialogue identified the following challenges and good practices:

▪ Challenges

- A high level of coordination is required for the development and implementation of targets and actions related to the Protocols, including with respect to the need to engage with additional types of stakeholders
- There is a lack of high-level political support for the full scope of issues related to integrating the Protocols into the Framework, particularly in the context of Targets 13 and 17. Some participants noted that Target 13 was a lower political priority in their country

- Questions related to the future of digital sequence information could impact planning related to Target 13
- As each Protocol and each multilateral environmental agreement has its own process and national-level actors, countries that are not a party to one or both Protocols may face difficulties in setting targets related to access and benefit-sharing and biosafety and biotechnology
- The Protocols and Targets 13 and 17 require specific technical expertise
- Conceptual differences regarding some elements of Targets 13 and 17 may necessitate additional engagement
- Raising awareness on different rules and focusing on user compliance for access and benefit-sharing constitute a challenge
- Silos of implementation exist for access and benefit-sharing, that is to say, research and genetic resources are separate and bringing them together is a common challenge
- There is a divergence of opinions on whether it is useful to include the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety in the national biodiversity strategy and action plan
- More regional and global training programmes, conducted in cooperation with the Secretariat and regional experts, are needed to facilitate an understanding of the Nagoya Protocol, risk assessment, access and benefit-sharing and sharing of good practices
- Specific projects on biosecurity and biosafety can help take the issue forward, including the proposed regional project which is being developed
- **Good practices:**
 - Many countries in the region have strong legal frameworks for access and benefit-sharing and genetically modified organisms, which can serve as examples for integrating the Protocols into national biodiversity strategies and action plans
 - A regional project is currently being developed to support biosecurity and biosafety frameworks which would help enable the sharing of technical expertise across the region
 - The European Union provides guidance and information on biosafety, which can aid in the development of national policies
 - As there are specific and dedicated types of funding available for targets related to the Protocols, it may be easier to attract funding for those targets than for some other targets under the Framework
 - National-level stakeholder consultations are crucial for these targets, as they involve a broader range of stakeholders compared with many other Framework targets

III. National target setting or revision

The participants in the dialogue identified the following challenges and good practices:

- **Challenges:**
 - Setting new national targets for areas not traditionally addressed by the biodiversity community, such as Targets 9 to 23, presents a challenge. Some countries noted that women are already engaged in the development and implementation of the national biodiversity strategy and action plan, making Target 23 a lower priority
 - The cross-cutting nature of issues like capacity-building under Target 20 may be easier to address within the context of each individual target. There is a need for capacity-building efforts related to both the targets and their monitoring

- The timeline is very tight and processes for target approval at the political level are lengthy
 - There is difficulty in costing the implementation of targets. Some countries are including cost estimates in their target setting process, while others are not
 - Target setting can be challenging owing to uncertainty of financing. Some countries expressed interest in establishing ambitious national targets which could be achieved with additional funding, while ensuring that there are targets which would be achievable based on available resources
 - Engaging businesses, youth, women and other groups in target setting and implementation has been identified as a challenge. There is a need for support from businesses and other sectors for the sharing of information on their contributions to the Kunming-Montreal Global Biodiversity Framework, including through a public platform on non-State actor commitments
- **Good practices**
- Reviewing the existing national biodiversity strategy and action plan against the Framework to identify which targets need revision is an efficient starting point
 - Some targets are covered in other sectoral and cross-sectoral strategies and plans, which can help increase engagement and financing for those targets
 - Whole-of-government approaches improve target setting. Establishing a working group can clarify the responsibilities of interministerial divisions and the duration of those responsibilities
 - Many countries have completed and submitted (or are close to submitting) their national targets
 - Most countries are covering all or nearly all of the Framework targets in their national targets
 - The European Union Biodiversity Strategy for 2030 is well aligned with the Framework and some countries have shared their experiences aligning with both strategies when setting national targets. However, the varying closing times of European Union programmes present a challenge
 - The experiences of countries that have already set national targets could be shared across the region
 - The Intergovernmental Science-Policy Platform on Biodiversity and Ecosystem Services methodology has been used to collect nature use data and some countries in the region have been working towards using those data to inform the development of national targets

IV. Development of a national monitoring plan

The participants in the dialogue identified the following issues:

- Many countries have existing monitoring systems and are planning to develop indicators for monitoring national targets
- There is a need for additional capacity-building and support for developing national monitoring systems which will cover biodiversity outcomes as well as support monitoring of implementation/action
- Research institutions and non-governmental organizations could support work on monitoring
- As many of the indicators in the monitoring framework are not yet operational in countries, reporting data for those indicators will be challenging

- In some cases, indicators in use need to be better linked to the implementation of the national biodiversity strategy and action plan
- Monitoring of cross-cutting issues, including under section C of the Framework, is a challenge
- Improving communication on indicators is a challenge

V. Other challenges or needs for further support for the updating or revision of the national biodiversity strategy and action plan

The participants in the dialogue identified the following issues:

- Some countries have experienced difficulties in starting their Global Environment Facility Early Action Support project, which has slowed the development of the national biodiversity strategy and action plan
- Many countries are members of the European Union or are European Union accession countries, which imposes the additional task of ensuring alignment with both the Framework and the European Union Biodiversity Strategy for 2030

VI. Capacity-building and development and finance

The participants at the dialogue identified the following issues:

- It is important to systematically undertake national capacity assessments, including stocktaking of existing capacities and assessing and prioritizing capacity gaps and needs at the individual, institutional and enabling environment levels, target by target, and then develop a national capacity development plan as part of the updated national biodiversity strategy and action plan
- It is important to identify specific needs related to the implementation of each target and avoid generalization in the context of capacity and finance needs
- It is crucial to identify and map relevant stakeholders that should be involved in capacity-building, taking into account their level of interest and influence and using the interest-influence matrix to develop a stakeholder engagement plan and define the roles and responsibilities of various stakeholders
- It is important to build and develop capacities through continuous institutionalized activities and programmes rather than through disjointed ad hoc interventions and devise strategies for retaining the capacities developed
- Biodiversity finance was highlighted as a key need during all sessions of the dialogue. Finance is needed to engage stakeholders, achieve integration of the Protocols and other multilateral environment agreements, set national targets, develop a monitoring system, build capacity and implement the national biodiversity strategy and action plan. The Biodiversity Finance Initiative methodology was highlighted as offering an opportunity in that regard
- A case needs to be made for convincing ministries of finance, financial institutions and the private sector to increase budgetary support for and investment in biodiversity through enhanced communication, while using language that is understandable to those entities
- Main challenges include lack of political support for biodiversity financing and building national capacity and limited availability of resources, financial flows and human resources. Possible solutions include creating a policy environment conducive to biodiversity financing, including through building awareness of the importance of biodiversity and increased stakeholder engagement

VII. Piloting of an open-ended forum for voluntary country review

The participants in the dialogue identified the following issues:

- Countries recognize that regional dialogues provide important opportunities for countries in the region to share experiences and lessons learned in the implementation of the Convention and its Protocols and the Framework and promote mutual learning through addressing common challenges and identifying possible solutions or sharing relevant good practices
-