



Convention on Biological Diversity

Distr.
GENERAL

UNEP/CBD/SBI/1/2
18 March 2016*

ORIGINAL: ENGLISH

SUBSIDIARY BODY ON IMPLEMENTATION

First meeting

Montreal, Canada, 2-6 May 2016

Item 4 of the provisional agenda**

PROGRESS IN THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE CONVENTION AND THE STRATEGIC PLAN FOR BIODIVERSITY 2011-2020 AND TOWARDS THE ACHIEVEMENT OF THE AICHI BIODIVERSITY TARGETS

Note by the Executive Secretary

I. BACKGROUND

1. In decision X/2, the Conference of the Parties, decided that at its future meetings it would review progress in the implementation of the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020 (para. 14), and requested the Executive Secretary to prepare an analysis/synthesis of national, regional and other actions, including targets as appropriate, established in accordance with the Strategic Plan (para. 17 (b)), to enable the Conference of Parties to assess the contribution of such national and regional targets towards the global targets.

2. Further, in decision X/2, paragraph 3, the Conference of the Parties urged Parties to review, and as appropriate, update and revise, their national biodiversity strategies and action plans, in line with the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020 and the guidance adopted in decision IX/9, integrating their national targets developed in the framework of the Strategic Plan and its Aichi Biodiversity Targets into their national biodiversity strategies and action plans. Subsequently, in decision XII/2 A, paragraph 4, the Conference of the Parties urged those Parties that had not yet done so, to review and, as appropriate, update and revise their national biodiversity strategies and action plans in line with the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020, to adopt indicators at the national level as soon as possible and, in any event, no later than October 2015, and to submit their fifth national reports.

3. In decision XII/31, the Conference of the Parties reaffirmed that it should review progress in the implementation of the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020 at each of its meetings to 2020, and that the development of further guidance for policy development and to support implementation should be based on this review as well as on information available in national reports and on other information that may become available, including through scientific assessments. Further, in the annex to this decision, it was agreed that the thirteenth meeting of the Conference of the Parties should undertake an interim

* Reissued for technical reasons on 31 March 2016.

** UNEP/CBD/SBI/1/1/Rev.1.

review of progress towards the implementation of the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020 and the achievement of the Aichi Biodiversity Targets, and related means of implementation.

4. The present note assesses progress towards implementation of the Convention and the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020 and towards the achievement of the Aichi Biodiversity Targets in line with the above decisions. It is based on information contained in the revised and updated national biodiversity strategies and action plans as well as the fifth national reports to the Convention on Biological Diversity. The present note is complimented by several addenda:

(a) Update and analysis of national biodiversity strategies and action plans received after the adoption of the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020 (UNEP/CBD/SBI/1/2/Add.1);

(b) Analysis of the contribution of targets established by Parties and progress towards the Aichi Biodiversity Targets (UNEP/CBD/SBI/1/2/Add.2);

(c) Implementation of the programme of work on Article 8(j) and related provisions, including the plan of action on customary sustainable use of biodiversity (UNEP/CBD/SBI/1/2/Add.3).

5. Information on progress towards Aichi Biodiversity Target 16 related to access and benefit-sharing is contained in document UNEP/CBD/SBI/1/3.¹ In addition information related to resources mobilization and the attainment of Aichi Biodiversity Target 20 is contained in document UNEP/CBD/SBI/1/7/Add.1.² Further, assessment of progress towards other Aichi Biodiversity Targets is contained in document UNEP/CBD/SBSTTA/20/2³ which was prepared for the twentieth meeting of the Subsidiary Body on Scientific, Technical and Technological Advice.

II. REVIEW OF IMPLEMENTATION

6. The midterm review of progress towards the implementation of the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020 concluded that there has been encouraging progress towards meeting some elements of most Aichi Biodiversity Targets but, in most cases, this progress will not be sufficient to achieve the targets unless further urgent and effective action is taken to reduce the pressures on biodiversity and to prevent its continued decline. Additional information from updated and revised national biodiversity strategies and actions plans as well as fifth national reports that were not available for consideration in the mid-term review reinforces this overall conclusion.

A. National biodiversity strategies and action plans

7. National biodiversity strategies and action plans (NBSAPs) are the principal instrument for implementing the Convention at the national level. Since 1993, 184 Parties have developed at least one NBSAP, while 12 Parties have yet to submit their first.

8. In decision X/2, the Conference of the Parties urged Parties to review, revise and update, as appropriate, their NBSAPs in line with the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020. Aichi Biodiversity Target 17, which had a deadline of 2015, calls on Parties to develop, adopt as a policy instrument, and commence implementing an effective, participatory and updated NBSAP. Parties also committed to

¹ Progress towards Aichi Biodiversity Target 16 on the Nagoya Protocol on Access to Genetic Resources and the Fair and Equitable Sharing of Benefits Arising from their Utilization.

² Resource mobilization: Analysis of the information provided by Parties through the Financial Reporting Framework, and options for strengthening biodiversity-related financial information systems.

³ Updated assessment of progress towards selected Aichi Biodiversity Targets.

establishing national targets, using the Strategic Plan and its Aichi Biodiversity Targets as a flexible framework.

9. Since the tenth meeting of the Conference of the Parties, the majority of Parties have initiated revisions of their NBSAPs in response to decision X/2. A total of 67 Parties met the 2015 deadline, and 11 others have submitted their NBSAPs by 16 February 2016, making a total of 78. This represents approximately 40 per cent of the Parties to the Convention.

10. Document UNEP/CBD/SBI/1/2/Add.1 summarizes progress in revising and implementing NBSAPs and national targets and analyses the contents of the post-Nagoya NBSAPs submitted by 31 December 2015. This analysis is based on criteria from decision IX/8 which provides detailed guidance on the process, contents and components of NBSAPs. It indicates that many of the revised NBSAPs show substantial improvements over previous NBSAPs as reflected in the global assessment⁴ undertaken in 2010, in terms of their legal status, their building on assessments of their predecessor documents, the engagement of other government ministries and other criteria.

11. The NBSAP analysis also includes a section on Parties' adoption of the revised NBSAPs as policy instruments as committed in Aichi Biodiversity Target 17. It concludes that 23 revised NBSAPs have been adopted as "whole-of-government" instruments while the majority of the rest of the revised NBSAPs do not provide sufficient information to know if they have been adopted as a policy instrument, or, if they have been, what type of instruments they are.

12. The analysis also shows that few of the revised NBSAPs contain resource mobilization strategies, communication and public awareness strategies, and capacity development strategies as the NBSAP guidance suggests. Further, only a few NBSAPs demonstrate that biodiversity is being mainstreamed significantly into cross sectoral plans and policies, poverty eradication policies, or even into sustainable development plans. Evidence of the use of valuation studies to encourage mainstreaming in countries, as reported in the revised NBSAPs, seems to be quite low.

13. These findings contrast significantly with the aspirations communicated in the revised NBSAPs. Many Parties have either set targets or otherwise stated an intent to implement actions on resource mobilization, valuation, establishment of the national clearing-house mechanism, communication and public awareness, capacity development, development of subnational biodiversity plans, among other topics.

14. The majority of NBSAPs developed or revised since the tenth meeting of the Conference of the Parties contain targets related to the Aichi Biodiversity Targets, though, for some Aichi Targets, such as Targets 3, 6, 10, 14 and 17, there were many NBSAPs without associated national targets or commitments. Aichi Biodiversity Targets 1, 9, 11, 12, 16 and 19 are the Aichi Targets with the greatest number of broadly similar national targets or commitments. However, even in these cases, the number of NBSAPs with targets having a similar scope and level of ambition as the Aichi Targets rarely surpassed 25 per cent. Overall, the majority of national targets and/or commitments contained in the NBSAPs were lower than the Aichi Targets or did not address all of the elements of the Aichi Target. Generally, the national targets that have been set to date are more general than the Aichi Targets. As more NBSAPs are received, this overall picture may change.

15. Many countries have established targets or made commitments in the framework of other international processes, beyond the Convention on Biological Diversity, and many of these targets and commitments may be relevant to the Aichi Biodiversity Targets. For example, as part of the intended nationally determined contributions (iNDCs) to the Paris Climate Agreement, many countries have

⁴ http://www.ias.unu.edu/resource_centre/UNU-IAS_Biodiversity_Planning_NBSAPs_Assessment_final_web_Oct_2010.pdf

included targets for reducing deforestation or promoting ecosystem restoration, related to Aichi Biodiversity Targets 5 and 15, respectively. However, such targets are not always reflected in the updated national biodiversity strategies and action plans. There is an opportunity, therefore, for Parties, when establishing or reviewing their national targets under the Convention, to take into account relevant targets under other processes.

16. Decision X/2 urged Parties to develop national and regional targets with a view to contributing to collective global efforts to reach the global Aichi Biodiversity Targets. If the NBSAPs which are yet to be finalized follow a pattern similar to those already developed, it is unlikely that the aggregation of the additional national commitments will correspond to the scale and level of ambition set out in the global Aichi Targets. Further information on the progress made in developing, revising and updating national biodiversity strategies and action plans is contained in documents UNEP/CBD/SBI/1/2/Add.1 and UNEP/CBD/SBI/1/2/Add.2.

B. National reports

17. In adopting the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020,⁵ the Conference of the Parties noted the need to keep its implementation under review. The national reports are a main source of information for doing this. In decision X/10, the Conference of the Parties requested Parties to submit their fifth national report by 31 March 2014. By 3 March 2016, 175 fifth national reports had been received.

18. Information contained in 166 fifth national reports on the status, trends and pressures on biodiversity as well as information on the different actions that countries have reported taking or will be taking in the near future was used to determine overall progress towards the Aichi Biodiversity Targets and the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020. The assessment of the information in the national reports indicate that the majority of Parties have made progress towards the Aichi Targets but at a rate that is insufficient to allow the targets to be met by the deadline unless additional actions are taken. Across all Aichi Biodiversity Target, between a third and three quarters of the national reports contain information suggesting that progress towards a given target is being made but at an insufficient rate. Further, across all Aichi Biodiversity Target, between 4 and 45 per cent of national reports contain information suggesting that either no significant change has occurred or that the country is moving away from a given target. The number of assessments classified as being on track to reach an Aichi Biodiversity Target, or on track to exceed it, ranges between 1 and 33 per cent depending on the target. Overall the assessment of information in the national reports indicates that between 64 and 87 per cent of Parties are not on track to attain a given Aichi Biodiversity Target. This assessment is consistent with that presented in the fourth edition of the *Global Biodiversity Outlook*, which, based on an assessment of 64 fifth national reports, concluded that between two and 42 per cent of Parties were on track to attain or exceed a given Aichi Biodiversity Target. Further information on the progress made reaching the Aichi Biodiversity Targets as presented in the national reports is contained in document UNEP/CBD/SBI/1/2/Add.2.

19. Three Aichi Biodiversity Targets have 2015 deadlines. As previously noted in decision XII/1, Aichi Biodiversity Target 10 (“By 2015, the multiple anthropogenic pressures on coral reefs, and other vulnerable ecosystems impacted by climate change or ocean acidification are minimized, so as to maintain their integrity and functioning”) has not been met though it remains valid.

20. Good progress is being made towards Aichi Biodiversity Target 16 (“By 2015, the Nagoya Protocol on Access to Genetic Resources and the Fair and Equitable Sharing of Benefits Arising from their Utilization is in force and operational, consistent with national legislation”). Since the adoption of the Nagoya Protocol and the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity in 2010, a number of initiatives have been

⁵ Decision X/2.

undertaken by Parties to the Convention to achieve Target 16 and making progress in the ratification and operationalization of the Protocol. The entry into force of the Protocol on 12 October 2014 marked the achievement of the first part of Target 16, and many Parties are currently working on revising existing ABS measures or developing new ones to implement the Protocol. It is clear that Parties are still in the process of establishing or revising ABS measures to implement the Protocol and publishing the necessary information in the ABS Clearing-House. While progress has been made, the operationalization of the Protocol, as required by the second part of Target 16, has not yet been fully achieved. Further information on this issue can be found in document UNEP/CBD/SBI/1/3.

21. With regard to Aichi Biodiversity Target 17 (By 2015 each Party has developed, adopted as a policy instrument, and has commenced implementing an effective, participatory and updated national biodiversity strategy and action plan.), only 40 per cent of Parties have developed an NBSAP or revised one since the adoption of the Strategic Plan. Further, fewer than half of these have clearly adopted their NBSAPs as “whole-of-government” instruments. Given this, it is clear that Aichi Biodiversity Target 17, which has a deadline of 2015, has not been met. This assessment differs from that presented in the fourth edition of the *Global Biodiversity Outlook*, which concluded, based on the information available when it was prepared, that the first part of Aichi Biodiversity Target 17 (each Party has developed an NBSAP) was on track to be met. Proposals for the voluntary peer review of national biodiversity strategies and action plans are presented in document UNEP/CBD/SBI/1/10.⁶

22. Based on information contained in national reports or provided by Parties through other channels as well as contributions of members of the Global Partnership for Plant Conservation, Botanic Gardens Conservation International prepared a report on progress in implementation of the targets of the Global Strategy for Plant Conservation (GSPC). This report, which is made available as document UNEP/CBD/SBI/1/INF/32, provides an update on progress that has occurred towards specific GSPC targets in the period since the midterm review, highlighting how this progress contributes to the achievement of the Aichi Biodiversity targets. It also provides an update on national and regional responses to the GSPC. Additional information on the contribution of the Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species of Wild Flora and Fauna (CITES), including from 34 Parties to CITES that reported on their contribution to the implementation of the GSPC, is contained in document UNEP/CBD/SBI/1/INF/33.

C. Progress in implementing Article 8(j) and related provisions, including the plan of action on customary sustainable use of biological diversity

23. Of 59 NBSAPs analysed, 30 per cent referred to indigenous peoples and local communities. Further some improvements in both the effective participation of indigenous peoples and local communities in the national implementation of the Convention have been noted. The benefits of involving communities in the designation, management and monitoring of protected areas, including by the recognition of indigenous community conservation areas (ICCAs), is gaining acceptance in many countries. Additionally, 28 Parties have established National Focal Points for Article 8(j) and related provisions. Further some advances have been made in establishing minimal standards for access and use of traditional knowledge, such as prior informed consent or approval and involvement, and benefit-sharing, especially concerning measures taken under the Nagoya Protocol. However, overall, the information from the NBSAPs suggest that greater efforts are needed to reflect the effective participation of indigenous peoples and local communities in the national implementation of the Convention as well as in actions to attain Aichi Biodiversity Target 18.

24. With regard to the plan of action on customary sustainable use of biological diversity, which was endorsed during the twelfth meeting of the Conference of the Parties to the Convention, there is currently

⁶ Modus operandi of the Subsidiary Body on Implementation and mechanisms to support review of implementation.

limited information regarding its implementation. Of the 59 NBSAPs examined only 5 per cent have mentioned customary sustainable use. However, Benin, Australia, Canada, New Zealand and the Forest Peoples Programme have referred to customary sustainable use in recent submissions in response to decision XII/12.

25. The Secretariat, along with partners has been carrying out a range of capacity-building activities to help develop a network of indigenous peoples and local community that is familiar with the work of the Convention on Biological Diversity. These activities, which have been implemented with the financial support of the Governments of Guatemala, Japan and Sweden, has enabled participants to organize local, subnational and national workshops and assisted in their effective participation in the meetings of the Convention, as well as increased their awareness about the importance of the Convention on Biological Diversity, the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity, 2011-2020 and the Nagoya Protocol. Currently, these capacity-building activities are funded until December 2016.

26. There has also been some progress in incorporating Article 8(j) on traditional knowledge and Article 10(c) on customary sustainable use of biological diversity into other areas of work under the Convention. For example, for Aichi Biodiversity Target 15 there has been increased interest in the possible contributions of indigenous peoples and local communities on issues associated with ecosystem restoration, ecosystem-based approaches to climate change adaptation and disaster risk reduction. Similarly with regard to the Nagoya Protocol mechanisms exist for the effective participation of indigenous peoples and local communities as observers in relevant meetings.

27. In decision XII/12, the Conference of the Parties invited Parties, other Governments, international organizations, indigenous and local communities and other relevant organizations to submit information on the implementation of the programme of work on Article 8(j) and related provisions and mechanisms to promote the effective participation of indigenous and local communities in the work of the Convention. By 11 January 2016, 10 submissions had been received by the Secretariat. These submissions suggest moderate progress towards the attainment of some components of Aichi Target 18 (for further information, see document UNEP/SBI/1/INF/2). However, overall, the information available on the progress made in implementing Article 8(j) and related provisions, including the plan of action on customary sustainable use of biological diversity,⁷ suggests that, while some progress has been made by some Parties, greater efforts are required to ensure that indigenous peoples and local communities can effectively participate in and support the implementation of the Convention and that Aichi Biodiversity Target 18 can be met. Further information on the progress on this issue is contained in document UNEP/CBD/SBI/1/2/Add.3.

III. CONCLUSION

28. While the information from the assessment of NBSAPs relates to commitments and the information from the national reports relates to actions and outcomes, the two sources of information provide a consistent picture. Efforts have been made to translate the Aichi Biodiversity Targets into national commitments, and national actions have been taken to reach the Aichi Targets. However, these commitments and efforts will need to be significantly scaled up if the Aichi Biodiversity Targets and the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020, more generally, are to be met.

29. The information from this assessment is broadly consistent with the information presented in the fourth edition of the *Global Biodiversity Outlook*, which concluded that, while progress is being made towards the achievement of all targets, progress is not currently sufficient to achieve the Aichi Biodiversity Targets and that additional action is required to keep the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011–2020 on course.

⁷ Decision XII/12 B, annex.

30. Further information on possible actions to enhance implementation is presented in document UNEP/CBD/SBI/1/5.⁸ In addition information related to capacity-building as well as technical and scientific cooperation as it relates to the implementation of the Convention and the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020 is presented in document UNEP/CBD/SBI/1/6.

IV. RECOMMENDATIONS⁹

31. The Subsidiary Body on Implementation may wish to adopt a recommendation along the following lines:

The Subsidiary Body on Implementation

1. *Takes note* of the assessment of progress towards the implementation of the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020;¹⁰

2. *Emphasizing* that the effective review of progress towards the implementation of the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020 depends on the timely submission of information from Parties, and *recalling* decisions XI/3 and XII/2, *urges* those Parties that have not yet submitted their fifth national report to do so as a matter of urgency and, no later than 30 June 2016;

3. *Recalling* decisions IX/8 and XII/2, *urges* those Parties that have not yet updated their NBSAPs to do so as soon as possible and, if possible, no later than 30 June 2016;

4. *Requests* the Executive Secretary to update the assessment of progress towards the implementation of the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020 on the basis of information contained in additional national biodiversity strategies and action plans and fifth national reports that are received by 30 June 2016 and to make the updated assessment available for consideration by the Conference of the Parties at its thirteenth meeting.

32. The Subsidiary Body on Implementation may also wish recommend that the Conference of the Parties at its thirteenth meeting adopt a decision along the following lines:

The Conference of the Parties,

Recalling decisions X/2 and XII/1,

1. *Expresses its appreciation* to the [175]¹¹ Parties, listed in annex I, that have submitted their fifth national reports;

2. *Congratulates* the [82] Parties, listed in annex II, that have updated their national biodiversity strategies and action plans since 2010;

3. *Takes note* of the assessment of progress towards the implementation of the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020 and achievement of the Aichi Biodiversity Targets;¹²

⁸ Strategic actions to enhance implementation of the Convention and the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020.

⁹ This recommendation is complementary to those under agenda items 5 and 9 (regarding financial reporting).

¹⁰ UNEP/CBD/SBI/1/2 and addenda.

¹¹ Numbers in brackets to be updated ahead of the thirteenth meeting of the Conference of the Parties in the light of additional submissions.

¹² To be updated on the basis of documents UNEP/CBD/SBI/2 and addenda to reflect information in additional NBSAPs and fifth national reports that are received by 30 June 2016.

4. *Also takes note* of the updated report on progress towards the implementation of the Global Strategy for Plant Conservation;¹³

5. *Welcomes* the contribution by Parties to the Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species of Wild Fauna and Flora¹⁴ and by the Secretariat of that Convention to the implementation of the Global Strategy for Plant Conservation as reported to the Convention's Plants Committee;¹⁵

6. *Notes with satisfaction* that [most] of the NBSAPS developed or revised since 2010 contain targets related to the Aichi Biodiversity Targets, *also notes*, however, that only [a minority of] Parties have established targets with a level of ambition and scope commensurate with the Aichi Biodiversity Targets, and *notes with concern* that, for most of the Aichi Biodiversity Targets, the aggregate effect of national targets is not sufficient to attain the corresponding Aichi Biodiversity Targets;

7. *Notes with great concern* that Aichi Biodiversity Target 17 was not met by the target date of 2015;

8. *Notes with satisfaction* that the first element of Aichi Biodiversity Target 16 has been met, and *also notes*, however, that further efforts are needed to make the Protocol operational in line with the second part of the Aichi Biodiversity Target;

9. *Notes* the limited progress made towards Aichi Biodiversity Target 18 at the national level and in mainstreaming Article 8(j) and related provisions into various areas of work under the Convention, including capacity development and the participation of indigenous peoples and local communities in the work of the Convention;

10. *Recalls* decision XII/2 and, in this regard, *urges* those Parties that have not already done so to update their national biodiversity strategies and action plans using a participatory approach and to develop national and regional targets, using the Strategic Plan and its Aichi Targets, as a flexible framework, in accordance with national priorities and capacities and taking into account the various elements of the global targets and the status and trends of biological diversity within the country, and the resources provided through the strategy for resource mobilization, with a view to contributing to collective global efforts to reach the global targets;

11. *Encourages* Parties that have updated their national biodiversity strategies and action plans, to review these strategies and action plans, and the national targets contained therein, and, as appropriate, to consider increasing the level of ambition and/or scope of the national targets, so as to make a greater contribution to collective global efforts to achieve them;

12. *Encourages* Parties, when establishing or reviewing their national targets under the Convention, to take into account relevant national targets under other processes;

13. *Urges* Parties to ensure that national biodiversity strategies and action plans are adopted as policy instruments, to promote the mainstreaming of biodiversity at the national level across sectors of government, the economy and society;

14. *Urges* Parties to implement their updated national biodiversity strategies and action plans;

¹³ See documents UNEP/SBI/1/INF/32.

¹⁴ United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 993, No. 14537.

¹⁵ See documents UNEP/SBI/1/INF/33.

15. *Recalling* decision XII/1, *notes* that, while there has been significant progress towards the achievement of some elements of some of the Aichi Biodiversity Targets, for most targets the progress to date is insufficient to achieve them by 2020, and that further efforts are required if the Aichi Biodiversity Targets are to be achieved by 2020;

16. *Invites* the financial mechanism, and other donors, to continue to provide support, based on the expressed need of Parties, for the development, implementation and monitoring of national biodiversity strategies and action plans, including through participatory approaches;

17. *Invites* Parties, other Governments, indigenous peoples and local communities, and relevant organizations to submit updated information on progress towards the Aichi Biodiversity Targets, through the online reporting tool, in time to allow Executive Secretary to synthesize and make available the information for consideration by the Subsidiary Body on Implementation at its second meeting;

18. *Also invites* Parties, other Governments, indigenous peoples and local communities, and relevant organizations to submit updated information on progress towards Aichi Biodiversity Target 18 on traditional knowledge and customary sustainable use, including on the various elements of the Target, as well as implementation of the plan of action on customary sustainable use, in time to allow Executive Secretary to synthesize and make available the information for consideration by the Subsidiary Body on Implementation at its second meeting;

19. *Requests* the Executive Secretary to continue to report on progress in mainstreaming Article 8(j) and related provisions across the areas of work of the Convention, including capacity-building and the participation of indigenous peoples and local communities in the work of the Secretariat.

Annex I

**NATIONAL REPORTS RECEIVED BY THE SECRETARIAT OF THE CONVENTION ON
BIOLOGICAL DIVERSITY BY 3 MARCH 2016**

- | | |
|--------------------------------------|--------------------------------------|
| 1. Afghanistan | 32. China |
| 2. Albania | 33. Colombia |
| 3. Algeria | 34. Comoros |
| 4. Angola | 35. Congo |
| 5. Antigua and Barbuda | 36. Costa Rica |
| 6. Argentina | 37. Côte d'Ivoire |
| 7. Armenia | 38. Croatia |
| 8. Australia | 39. Cuba |
| 9. Austria | 40. Cyprus |
| 10. Azerbaijan | 41. Czech Republic |
| 11. Bahrain | 42. Democratic Republic of the Congo |
| 12. Bangladesh | 43. Denmark |
| 13. Belarus | 44. Djibouti |
| 14. Belgium | 45. Dominica |
| 15. Belize | 46. Dominican Republic |
| 16. Benin | 47. Ecuador |
| 17. Bhutan | 48. Egypt |
| 18. Bolivia (Plurinational State of) | 49. El Salvador |
| 19. Bosnia and Herzegovina | 50. Equatorial Guinea |
| 20. Botswana | 51. Eritrea |
| 21. Brazil | 52. Estonia |
| 22. Brunei Darussalam | 53. Ethiopia |
| 23. Bulgaria | 54. European Union |
| 24. Burkina Faso | 55. Fiji |
| 25. Burundi | 56. Finland |
| 26. Cambodia | 57. France |
| 27. Cameroon | 58. Gambia |
| 28. Canada | 59. Georgia |
| 29. Cabo Verde | 60. Germany |
| 30. Chad | 61. Ghana |
| 31. Chile | 62. Grenada |

63. Guatemala
64. Guinea
65. Guinea-Bissau
66. Guyana
67. Honduras
68. Hungary
69. India
70. Indonesia
71. Iran (Islamic Republic of)
72. Iraq
73. Ireland
74. Israel
75. Italy
76. Japan
77. Jordan
78. Kazakhstan
79. Kenya
80. Kiribati
81. Kuwait
82. Kyrgyzstan
83. Latvia
84. Lebanon
85. Liberia
86. Liechtenstein
87. Luxemburg
88. Madagascar
89. Malawi
90. Malaysia
91. Maldives
92. Mali
93. Malta
94. Mauritania
95. Mauritius
96. Mexico
97. Micronesia (Federated States of)
98. Monaco
99. Mongolia
100. Montenegro
101. Morocco
102. Mozambique
103. Myanmar
104. Namibia
105. Nauru
106. Nepal
107. Netherlands
108. New Zealand
109. Nicaragua
110. Niger
111. Nigeria
112. Niue
113. Norway
114. Oman
115. Pakistan
116. Palau
117. Panama
118. Peru
119. Philippines
120. Poland
121. Portugal
122. Qatar
123. Republic of Korea
124. Republic of Moldova
125. Romania
126. Russian Federation
127. Rwanda
128. Saint Kitts and Nevis
129. Saint Lucia
130. Saint Vincent and the Grenadines
131. Samoa
132. San Marino

133. Sao Tome and Principe
134. Saudi Arabia
135. Senegal
136. Serbia
137. Seychelles
138. Sierra Leone
139. Singapore
140. Slovakia
141. Slovenia
142. Solomon Islands
143. Somalia
144. South Africa
145. Spain
146. Sri Lanka
147. State of Palestine
148. Sudan
149. Suriname
150. Swaziland
151. Sweden
152. Switzerland
153. Tajikistan
154. Thailand
155. The former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia
156. Timor-Leste
157. Togo
158. Tonga
159. Tunisia
160. Turkey
161. Turkmenistan
162. Tuvalu
163. Uganda
164. Ukraine
165. United Arab Emirates
166. United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland
167. United Republic of Tanzania
168. Uruguay
169. Uzbekistan
170. Vanuatu
171. Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of)
172. Viet Nam
173. Yemen
174. Zambia
175. Zimbabwe

*Annex II***LIST OF NATIONAL BIODIVERSITY STRATEGIES AND ACTION PLANS RECEIVED BY
THE SECRETARIAT OF THE CONVENTION ON BIOLOGICAL DIVERSITY BETWEEN
OCTOBER 2010 AND 3 MARCH 2016**

- | | |
|---|---------------------------|
| 1. Afghanistan | 34. India |
| 2. Antigua and Barbuda | 35. Iraq |
| 3. Armenia | 36. Ireland |
| 4. Australia | 37. Italy |
| 5. Austria | 38. Japan |
| 6. Belarus | 39. Jordan |
| 7. Belgium | 40. Kyrgyzstan |
| 8. Benin | 41. Latvia |
| 9. Bhutan | 42. Liechtenstein |
| 10. Botswana | 43. Madagascar |
| 11. Burkina Faso | 44. Malawi |
| 12. Burundi | 45. Maldives |
| 13. Cameroon | 46. Mali |
| 14. Colombia | 47. Malta |
| 15. Congo | 48. Mauritania |
| 16. Côte d'Ivoire | 49. Mongolia |
| 17. Democratic People's Republic of Korea | 50. Myanmar |
| 18. Denmark | 51. Namibia |
| 19. Dominica | 52. Nepal |
| 20. Dominican Republic | 53. Netherlands |
| 21. El Salvador | 54. Niger |
| 22. Equatorial Guinea | 55. Nigeria |
| 23. Eritrea | 56. Niue |
| 24. Estonia | 57. Norway |
| 25. European Union | 58. Peru |
| 26. Finland | 59. Poland |
| 27. France | 60. Republic of Korea |
| 28. Gambia | 61. Republic of Moldova |
| 29. Georgia | 62. Saint Kitts and Nevis |
| 30. Greece | 63. Senegal |
| 31. Guatemala | 64. Serbia |
| 32. Guyana | 65. Seychelles |
| 33. Hungary | 66. Slovakia |

- | | |
|--------------------------|---|
| 67. Spain | 76. United Kingdom of Great Britain and
Northern Ireland |
| 68. Sudan | 77. United Republic of Tanzania |
| 69. Suriname | 78. Uruguay |
| 70. Switzerland | 79. Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of) |
| 71. Timor-Leste | 80. Viet Nam |
| 72. Togo | 81. Zambia |
| 73. Tuvalu | 82. Zimbabwe |
| 74. Uganda | |
| 75. United Arab Emirates | |
-