



## CONVENTION ON BIOLOGICAL DIVERSITY

Distr.  
GENERAL

UNEP/CBD/WG-RI/1/2  
13 July 2005

ORIGINAL: ENGLISH

---

### AD HOC OPEN-ENDED WORKING GROUP ON REVIEW OF IMPLEMENTATION OF THE CONVENTION

First meeting

Montreal, 5-9 September 2005

Item 3 of the provisional agenda\*

### IMPLEMENTATION OF THE CONVENTION AND THE STRATEGIC PLAN AND PROGRESS TOWARDS THE 2010 TARGET

*Note by the Executive Secretary*

#### EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

1. Progress in the implementation of the Convention and the Strategic Plan, and achievements leading up to the 2010 target, can be assessed against the overall framework provided by the goals and objectives of the strategic plan (decision VI/26) together with the framework of goals and sub-targets for evaluating progress towards the 2010 target (decision VII/30, annex II).
2. Progress is being made towards goal 1 (The Convention is fulfilling its leadership role in international biodiversity issues) and many of the objectives could be reached by 2010 through current or planned activities. However, there is little progress towards goal 2 (Parties have improved financial, human, scientific, technical, and technological capacity to implement the Convention) and this remains a major constraint on implementation. Progress towards goal 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) is also poor. While some 100 Parties have developed national biodiversity strategies and action plans (NBSAPs), this represents little over half of all Parties – 12 years after the entry into force of the Convention. 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) is mixed. Some stakeholders are well engaged in the Convention process, others less so. Overall, current communication, education and public awareness programmes are not sufficient to address the widespread lack of awareness and understanding of biodiversity.
3. In light of these results, the Working Group may wish to recommend that an in-depth analysis of the implementation of goals 2 and 3 be undertaken at its next meeting, and that guidance on the development and implementation of national biodiversity strategies and action plans, and the integration of biodiversity concerns into relevant sectors, be updated and consolidated.

---

\* UNEP/CBD/WG-RI/1/1.

4. It is too soon to assess whether there is any progress towards the target of achieving, by 2010, a significant reduction in the rate of biodiversity loss as compared to the rate of loss in 2002 when the target was set. Nonetheless, the set of indicators developed to monitor progress can be used to establish current trends. On the basis of current trends, and an analysis of future scenarios, the Millennium Ecosystem Assessment finds that unprecedented additional efforts would be needed to achieve, by 2010, a significant reduction in the rate of biodiversity loss at all levels.

5. The Strategic Plan already identifies a number of obstacles to the implementation of the Convention, which can serve as a framework for considering ways and means of identifying and overcoming obstacles to the effective implementation of the Convention.

## SUGGESTED RECOMMENDATIONS

1. The Working Group on Review of Implementation of the Convention may wish to recommend to the Conference of the Parties that it:

1. *Takes note* of the analysis of progress towards the goals of the Strategic Plan summarized in paragraph 5 of the present note;

2. *Decides* to consider, at its ninth meeting, the status of national biodiversity strategies and action plans, their implementation and updating, and the extent to which biodiversity concerns have been effectively mainstreamed in accordance with Article 6 (b) of the Convention on Biological Diversity;

3. *Decides* to consider, at its ninth meeting, consolidated and up-to-date guidance for the future development and implementation of national biodiversity strategies and action plans and the effective integration of biodiversity concerns into relevant sectors;

4. *Decides* that the Ad Hoc Open-ended Working Group on Review of Implementation of the Convention <sup>1/</sup> [or other subsidiary body], in preparation for the ninth meeting of the Conference of the Parties, will:

(a) Undertake an in-depth review of the implementation of goals 2 and 3 of the Strategic Plan (excluding consideration of the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety), on the basis, *inter alia*, of information provided in the third national reports and supplementary submissions provided by Parties, focusing in particular on:

(i) The status of national biodiversity strategies and action plans, their implementation and updating, and the extent to which biodiversity concerns are effectively integrated into relevant sectors;

(ii) The provision of financial resources, and capacity-building;

(b) Develop consolidated and up-to-date guidance for the development and implementation of national biodiversity strategies and action plans and cross-sectoral integration;

5. *Invites* Parties, where necessary, to supplement their third national reports by:

(a) Providing information on the status of national biodiversity strategies and action plans, their implementation and updating, and the extent to which biodiversity concerns have been effectively mainstreamed in accordance with Article 6 (b) of the Convention on Biological Diversity;

(b) Identifying the main obstacles to implementation of the Convention at national level, including obstacles to the implementation of national biodiversity strategies and action plans and to the effective integration of biodiversity concerns into relevant sectors (using as a framework the list of obstacles identified in the Strategic Plan), and ways and means by which these obstacles might be overcome.

2. The Working Group on Review of Implementation of the Convention may also wish to request the Executive Secretary to develop, for the consideration of the Conference of the Parties at its eighth meeting:

(a) An outline of issues to be addressed by the in-depth review of national biodiversity strategies and action plans referred to in paragraph 4 above;

(b) A proposal on the form and scope of guidance for the development and implementation of NBSAPs and cross-sectoral integration, referred to in paragraph 3 above;

(c) A preliminary review of the extent to which the information referred to in paragraph 5 above is provided in the third national reports.

---

<sup>1/</sup> This is consistent with the recommendation in note by the Executive Secretary on review of processes under the Convention (UNEP/CBD/WG-RI/1/3) to reconvene the Working Group on Review of Implementation prior to both the ninth and tenth meetings of the Conference of the Parties.

## I. INTRODUCTION

1. The mandate of the Ad Hoc Open-ended Working Group on the Review of Implementation of the Convention, established by decision VII/30, paragraph 23, is *inter alia*, to consider progress in the implementation of the Convention and the Strategic Plan and achievements leading up to the 2010 target, as part of the overall process for improving the operations of the Convention and implementation of the Strategic Plan, and to consider ways and means of identifying and overcoming obstacles to the effective implementation of the Convention. The present note has been prepared by the Executive Secretary to assist the Working Group in this task.

2. Progress in the implementation of the Convention and the Strategic Plan, and in meeting the 2010 target, can be assessed against the overall framework provided by the goals and objectives of the Strategic Plan (decision VI/26, annex) together with the framework of goals and sub-targets for evaluating progress towards the 2010 target (decision VII/30).<sup>2/</sup> Sections II and III of the note consider each of these items in turn. Section IV focuses on the status of implementation of national biodiversity strategies and action plans. Finally, section V considers ways and means of identifying and overcoming obstacles to the effective implementation of the Convention.

## II. IMPLEMENTATION OF THE GOALS AND SUB-TARGETS OF THE STRATEGIC PLAN

3. The Strategic Plan for the Convention was adopted in decision VI/26 in 2002—ten years after the Convention on Biological Diversity was opened for signature—in order to guide the Convention's further implementation at the national, regional and global levels. Through the Strategic Plan, Parties commit themselves to achieving, by 2010, a significant reduction of the current rate of biodiversity loss at the global, regional and national level, as a contribution to poverty alleviation and to the benefit of all life on Earth.

4. The Strategic Plan consists of four goals for enhanced implementation of the Convention, each with a set of related objectives. Table 1, on pages 9-13 below, provides an overview of progress towards these objectives and identifies some obstacles and possible opportunities for improving progress. The table also lists some possible indicators that are proposed for endorsement in the note by the Executive Secretary on framework for monitoring implementation of the Convention and achievement of the 2010 target, and review of the thematic programmes of work (UNEP/CBD/WG-RI/1/9).

5. Analysis of progress towards the achievement of the goals of the Strategic Plan is limited at present by a lack of information, and the following conclusions should therefore be treated as preliminary:

(a) *Goal 1: The Convention is fulfilling its leadership role in international biodiversity issues.* Progress is being made towards this goal and many of the objectives could be reached by 2010 through current or planned activities. For future progress, focused attention is needed to integrate biodiversity concerns into global and regional instruments and processes that relate to major economic sectors (such as agriculture, forestry, fisheries and trade), and in improving coherence at the national level;

(b) *Goal 2: Parties have improved financial, human, scientific, technical, and technological capacity to implement the Convention.* The current lack of significant progress towards this goal remains a major problem for the Convention, since lack of financial, human, scientific, technical, and technological capacity constitutes a major obstacle to implementation. There is a need for increased resources to be provided from both domestic and international sources. However, these are becoming increasingly linked as more development aid is provided through general budget support to developing countries. The underlying obstacles are lack of awareness of biodiversity and its importance among donors, other key actors and society at large, and lack of political will and support;

---

<sup>2/</sup> See also document the note by the Executive Secretary on framework for monitoring implementation of the Convention and achievement of the 2010 target, and review of the thematic programmes of work (UNEP/CBD/WG-RI/1/9).

(c) *Goal 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.* Progress towards this goal remains poor. While some 100 Parties have developed national biodiversity strategies and action plans, this represents little over half of all Parties—12 years after the entry into force of the Convention. Satisfactory implementation of national biodiversity strategies and action plans is presumably limited to even fewer countries. However, there is a paucity of good information available to gauge this, because of the low compliance rate in preparing national reports and the limited usefulness of the information contained therein. This lack of information limits the potential for improvement through either exchange of good practices among Parties or through feedback to inform further guidance to Conference of the Parties;

(d) *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.* Progress towards this goal is mixed. Indigenous and local community representatives and some stakeholders (such as many civil-society organizations) are well engaged with the Convention, although the involvement of indigenous and local communities at the national level is often limited. There is very little engagement of the private sector at any level, despite their significant impacts on biodiversity. Current communication, education and public awareness programmes are not sufficient to address the widespread lack of awareness and understanding of biodiversity.

6. Overall, it is apparent that while there is some progress in some areas, especially for goals 1 and 4, implementation of the Convention at the national level is still at an early stage. An in-depth analysis of progress towards goals 2 and 3 would help to provide further insight into implementation at the national level.

### III. PROGRESS TOWARDS THE 2010 TARGET

7. The framework to evaluate progress towards the 2010 target, adopted by the Conference of the Parties in its decision VII/30, includes eleven global goals, each with one to three targets. The framework also includes a number of indicators.

8. It is too early to assess whether there is any progress towards the target of achieving, by 2010, a significant reduction in the rate of biodiversity loss as compared to the rate of loss in 2002 when the target was set. More information, particularly on current trends, will be provided in the second Global Biodiversity Outlook. Nonetheless, the set of indicators developed to monitor progress can be used to establish current trends, and several of the indicators have in fact been used in the Millennium Ecosystem Assessment for this purpose. In addition, the prospects of attaining the various goals and targets can already be assessed based on current trends and scenarios for the future. Such an analysis has been conducted by the Millennium Ecosystem Assessment.

9. The Millennium Ecosystem Assessment finds that unprecedented additional efforts would be needed to achieve, by 2010, a significant reduction in the rate of biodiversity loss at the national, regional and global level. The magnitude of the challenge of slowing the rate of biodiversity loss is demonstrated by the fact that most of the direct drivers of biodiversity loss are projected to either remain constant or to increase in the near future (see figure 1 on page 19 below). Moreover, inertia in natural and human institutional systems results in time lags—of years, decades, or even centuries—between actions being taken and their impact on biodiversity and ecosystems becoming apparent.

10. The Assessment also finds that—with appropriate responses at the global, regional, and especially national level—it is possible to achieve, by 2010, a reduction in the rate of biodiversity loss for certain components of biodiversity or for certain indicators, and in certain regions. Several of the 2010 sub-targets adopted in decision VII/30 could also be met. For example, if areas of particular importance for biodiversity and functioning ecological networks are maintained within protected areas or by other conservation mechanisms, and if proactive measures are taken to protect endangered species, the rate of biodiversity loss of the targeted habitats and species could be reduced. Further, it would be possible to achieve many of the sub-targets aimed at protecting the components of biodiversity if the response

options that are already incorporated into the programmes of work of the Convention on Biological Diversity were implemented. However, it appears highly unlikely that the sub-targets aimed at addressing threats to biodiversity—land use change, climate change, pollution, and invasive alien species—could be achieved by 2010. It will also be a major challenge to maintain, until 2010 and over the next century, goods and services from biodiversity to support human well-being (see table 2 on pages 14-16 below).

#### **IV. IMPLEMENTATION OF NATIONAL BIODIVERSITY STRATEGIES AND ACTION PLANS**

11. Article 6 of the Convention requires each Party to develop or adapt national strategies, plans or programmes for the conservation and sustainable use of biological diversity and to integrate, as far as possible and as appropriate, the conservation and sustainable use of biological diversity into relevant sectoral or cross-sectoral plans, programmes and policies. The Conference of the Parties of the Convention has stressed, in paragraph 1 of its decision VI/27 A, that the development and implementation of national biodiversity strategies and action plans constitute the cornerstone of national implementation of the Convention. This is reflected in goal 3 of the Strategic Plan, namely, that “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”.

##### ***A. Guidance on the development and implementation of national biodiversity strategies and action plans***

12. Since its second meeting, when it considered Article 6 for the first time, the Conference of the Parties has issued a large amount of guidance on the development and implementation of national biodiversity strategies and action plans, which is summarized in the information document on guidance on national biodiversity strategies and action plans (UNEP/CBD/WG-RI/1/INF/8). At the second meeting of the Conference of the Parties, Parties were encouraged to collaborate with relevant organizations and, if so desired, take into consideration existing guidelines, such as those published by the United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP), the World Resources Institute and IUCN (decision II/7).

13. The Conference of the Parties addressed national biodiversity strategies and action plans most comprehensively at its sixth meeting, urging Parties, in paragraph 2 of its decision VI/27 A:

(a) To develop and adopt national biodiversity strategies and action plans, where they have not yet done so;

(b) To give priority to the integration of the conservation and sustainable use of biological diversity, as well as benefit-sharing, into relevant sectoral or cross-sectoral plans, programmes and policies, in accordance with Article 6 of the Convention;

(c) To identify priority actions in national biodiversity strategies and action plans and other relevant national strategies;

(d) To implement national biodiversity strategies and action plans; and to periodically revise them in the light of the experience of implementation;

(e) To establish national mechanisms or consultative processes, with particular regard, where appropriate, to the special needs of indigenous and local communities, for coordinating, implementing, monitoring, evaluating and periodically revising national biodiversity strategies and action plans;

(f) To identify constraints and impediments to implementation of national biodiversity strategies and action plans, and to reflect them in the national reports;

(g) To make their national biodiversity strategies and action plans, including periodic revisions, available through their national clearing-house mechanism and the Convention website.

14. Parties have also been invited to “set measurable targets to achieve biodiversity conservation and sustainable use objectives” (decision III/9, paragraph 5). At its seventh meeting, the Conference of the

Parties, in paragraphs 14 and 15 of its decision VII/30, emphasized that the goals and targets of the framework adopted in that decision should be viewed as a flexible framework within which national and/or regional targets may be developed, and invited Parties and Governments to develop national and/or regional goals and targets, and, as appropriate, to incorporate them into relevant plans, programmes and initiatives, including national biodiversity strategies and action plans. Additional specific guidance on national biodiversity strategies and action plans has been provided by the Conference of the Parties in a large number of decisions relating to specific programmes of work of the Convention, and on some cross-cutting issues (see UNEP/CBD/WG-RI/1/INF/8).

15. While decision VI/27 A provides useful general guidance on national biodiversity strategies and action plans, there are a number of shortcomings in the total body of guidance developed:

(a) Guidance relating to the substantive scope of national biodiversity strategies and action plans is scattered among a large number of individual decisions, particularly among those dealing with the thematic programmes of work;

(b) There are a number of tools developed by the Conference of the Parties (including, for example, the principles and guidance on the ecosystem approach and the guidelines on environmental assessments) that are probably not used to their full potential in developing and implementing national biodiversity strategies and action plans;

(c) Parties have been encouraged to promote national biodiversity strategies and action plans with corresponding plans and strategies under other Conventions (including the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change and the United Nations Convention to Combat Desertification) and to include elements relevant to the other biodiversity-related conventions, but little specific guidance has been made available regarding this issue;

(d) The guidelines recommended for use in 1995 have not been updated and therefore do not reflect the growing body of guidance of the Conference of Parties including that on the thematic programmes of work. Moreover, the Biodiversity Planning Support Project, previously operated by the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP), is no longer operational.

16. Against this background the Working Group may wish to consider the need to consolidate and update the tools and guidance available to Parties on national biodiversity strategies and action plans. In doing so, the Working Group should be conscious of the need to avoid introducing new and additional obligations in the lead up to 2010.

***B. Status of the development and implementation of national biodiversity strategies and action plans***

17. As of May 2005, 108 Parties had completed their national biodiversity strategies and action plans. The Secretariat is aware of another 15 Parties that have prepared drafts or have national biodiversity strategies and action plans awaiting government approval, and 17 countries where they are currently under preparation. Two Parties have already revised their original national biodiversity strategy and action plan.

18. While over 70 per cent of the developing countries or countries with economies in transition that submitted second national reports indicated that support from the financial mechanisms for the preparation of national biodiversity strategies and action plans had been made available, three out of four reporting Parties identified lack of resource as a factor limiting their ability to meet their obligations under the Convention.

19. According to the second national reports, almost 85 per cent of national biodiversity strategies and action plans cover most or all articles of the Convention and over 60 per cent cover the integration of all major sectors.

20. However, only about 10 per cent of responding Parties indicate that they have reports on the implementation of their national biodiversity strategy and action plan, and only about 7 per cent have measurable targets in place.

21. By paragraph 41 of decision V/20, the Conference of the Parties invited Parties, to undertake, on a voluntary basis, a review of national programmes and needs related to the implementation of the Convention. Seven Parties made available reports to the Convention in response to this, which are available as an information document (UNEP/CBD/WG-RI/1/INF/2). These submissions vary in content and do not provide an overview of the status of implementation of national biodiversity strategies and action plans.

22. According to this analysis, only 57 per cent of Parties (108 of 188) have completed their national biodiversity strategies and action plans—ten years after the Conference of the Parties initiated the process of developing them. Furthermore, it appears that only a very small minority of Parties have updated their national biodiversity strategies and action plans, or issued reports on their implementation.

23. Furthermore, in the absence of such reports, it is difficult to ascertain the extent to which biodiversity issues are effectively integrated into national sectoral and cross-sectoral policies. To date, the implementation of national biodiversity strategies and action plans has not been subject to an in-depth analysis by the Conference of the Parties or one of its subsidiary bodies.

24. The Working Group might wish to recommend that in-depth analysis of the implementation by Parties of their national biodiversity strategies and action plans and of the integration of biodiversity into national sectoral and cross-sectoral policies, programmes and plans be undertaken by a subsequent meeting of the Working Group in order to inform discussion on this issue by the Conference of the Parties. As noted above, the Working Group might also develop consolidated and up-to-date guidance for the development and implementation of national biodiversity strategies and action plans and the integration of biodiversity concerns into relevant sectors for consideration by the Conference of the Parties at its ninth meeting.

25. The review might:

(a) Examine examples of the various approaches to national biodiversity strategies and action plans and identify any lessons learned from the experience of Parties in developing and implementing them;

(b) Examine needs for technical and financial support for the implementation of national biodiversity strategies and action plans.

The review would draw upon relevant information provided in the third national reports. In preparation for the review, Parties might also be invited to make available, through the clearing-house mechanism, supplementary information, including existing reports, on the implementation of national biodiversity strategies and action plans, their integration into sectors, the use of measurable targets and their alignment with outcomes, making use of the framework provided by decision VII/30. The review might also build upon the experience in other conventions and processes such as the United Nations Convention to Combat Desertification and the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (see UNEP/CBD/WG-RI/1/INF/8).

## **V. OBSTACLES TO THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE CONVENTION**

26. One task of the Working Group is to consider ways and means of identifying and overcoming obstacles to the effective implementation of the Convention. The Strategic Plan already identifies a number of obstacles to the implementation of the Convention, which are reproduced in table 4 on page 18 below, and the preliminary analysis of implementation of the Strategic Plan suggests that these obstacles still apply. It is proposed therefore that the Working Group make use of this list when considering ways and means of overcoming obstacles. The Working Group may also wish to invite Parties to use this framework in considering ways and means of identifying and overcoming obstacles to the effective implementation of the Convention at the national level.



**Table 1: Implementation of the goals and sub-targets of the Strategic Plan**

Strategic goals and objectives	Possible indicators <sup>3/</sup>	Areas with / examples of significant progress	Areas with / examples of little progress	Overall assessment	Obstacles <sup>4/</sup>	Opportunities for improving progress
<b>Goal 1: The Convention is fulfilling its leadership role in international biodiversity issues.</b>						
<b>1.1 The Convention is setting the global biodiversity agenda.</b>	CBD provisions, COP decisions & 2010 target reflected in: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>agenda of major international fora</li> <li>Biodiv-related organizations</li> <li>Biodiv-related and general media</li> </ul>	CBD 2010 target adopted/ supported by WSSD, UNGA, IUCN EA approach and some other guidance widely used in Biodiv-related organizations CBD & 2010 framework setting agenda for scientific community's work on indicators etc.	General media Development agenda	Yes, examples: 2010 target adopted by WSSD, UNGA, EU, pan-Europe; indicators used; CBD concerns addressed by a number of other conventions (see 1.2, 1.3)	Complexity of biodiversity and broad scope mean that many bodies need to be reached	Media outreach (.see 4.1., see also 1.2, 1.3. Millennium Campaign
<b>1.2 The Convention is promoting cooperation between all relevant international instruments and processes to enhance policy coherence.</b>	Number of meetings & communications with other relevant international instruments and processes Number of relevant international instruments and processes that have taken up CBD provisions and COP decisions	Ramsar: joint adoption of guidance IPPC: developed standards that include CBD concerns UNFCCC: welcomes report on BD-CC linkages ITPGR: Treaty negotiated in harmony with CBD	Economic, trade and development processes (WTO, World Bank etc.) Fisheries, Forestry & Agriculture: (limited beyond genetic resources and phytosanitary concerns)	CBD collaborates with a wide range of partners and promotes collaboration, but only patchwork approach Relevant international instruments and processes have taken up CBD provisions and COP decisions to limited extent	Different parties & mandates, separate governing bodies relating to different ministries; Often little coherence in national positions among different fora Limited capacity of SCBD to participate in all relevant international instruments and processes	Liaison Groups General Assembly and ECOSOC decisions Cooperation among national focal points
<b>1.3 Other international processes are actively supporting implementation of the Convention, in a manner consistent with their respective frameworks.</b>	Number of relevant international instruments and processes that are actively supporting implementation of the Convention	Ramsar IUCN FAO (in part)	Economic, trade and development processes (WTO, World Bank etc.) FAO (in part)	Several biodiversity-related and some other processes are actively supporting implementation of the Convention, at least in part, including voluntary initiatives, but many are not, especially in broader economic sectors	Specific and limited agendas of other bodies Competition for funding/resources	Broadly adopted 2010 target Global Partnership for Biodiversity See also 1.5
<b>1.4 The Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety is widely implemented.</b>	Number of Parties % trade (value/quantity of products) underlying regulation in accordance	Large number of parties, almost all countries have signed and/or ratified	Major LMO growers and exporting countries have not ratified Limited capacity in many	Too soon to assess implementation in a meaningful way		

<sup>3/</sup> Need to clarify distinction between 1.1 and 1.3; between 1.2 and 1.5 etc.

<sup>4/</sup> May be better to align these with the list of Obstacles in the Appendix to the Strategic Plan.

Strategic goals and objectives	Possible indicators <u>3/</u> with the Protocol	Areas with / examples of significant progress	Areas with / examples of little progress developing countries	Overall assessment	Obstacles <u>4/</u>	Opportunities for improving progress
<b>1.5 Biodiversity concerns are being integrated into relevant sectoral or cross-sectoral plans, programmes and policies at the regional and global levels.</b>	Number of regional/global plans, programmes and policies which specifically address the integration of biodiversity concerns into relevant sectoral or cross-sectoral plans, programmes and policies Application of planning tools such as strategic environmental assessment to assess the degree to which BD concerns are being integrated Criteria of multilateral donors and regional development banks	Regional Seas Conventions Forest management and watershed and river basin management, to some extent	Aid/development programmes Regional Fishery Management Organizations	Some progress via global conventions (see 1.2, 1.3, above). Many more opportunities at global and regional levels	Lack of awareness or of biodiversity and its importance among relevant constituencies (e.g. the development cooperation community) Vested interests and lack of incentives	Framework of the Millennium Development goals
<b>1.6 Parties are collaborating at the regional and subregional levels to implement the Convention.</b>	Number of (sub-)regional projects submitted to GEF/EC/other funding bodies Number of transboundary protected areas Number of (sub-)regional biodiv-related agreements	EU	Most regions	Little known progress	Lack of awareness or of biodiversity and its importance among relevant constituencies	
<b>Goal 2: Parties have improved financial, human, scientific, technical, and technological capacity to implement the Convention.</b>						
<b>2.1 All Parties have adequate capacity for implementation of priority actions in national biodiversity strategy and action plans.</b>	Number of trained personnel in responsible ministries and agencies Budgets of responsible ministries and agencies			No. Few Parties accord sufficient resources to responsible ministries and agencies	Relatively weak political profile of responsible ministries and agencies Lack of resources, particularly in small developing countries and the least developed countries	
<b>2.2 Developing country Parties, in particular the least developed and the small island developing States amongst them, and other Parties with economies in transition, have sufficient resources</b>	In addition to 2.1: ODA devoted to biodiversity			No. In addition to 2.1, international finance and capacity building programmes are inadequate	Low domestic budgets Low aid budgets Lack of integration of biodiversity concerns into poverty and growth focused aid and investment programmes	Share of potential increase aid resources for MDG targets (Monterrey Consensus etc.)

Strategic goals and objectives	Possible indicators <u>3</u> /	Areas with / examples of significant progress	Areas with / examples of little progress	Overall assessment	Obstacles <u>4</u> /	Opportunities for improving progress
available to implement the three objectives of the Convention.						
<b>2.3 Developing country Parties, in particular the least developed and the small island developing States amongst them, and other Parties with economies in transition, have increased resources and technology transfer available to implement the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety.</b>	In addition to 2.4: ODA devoted to biosafety Trends in technology transfers available to implement the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety			Some increases in resources in some countries, but probably not sufficient; however, too soon to assess implementation in a meaningful way		.
<b>2.4 All Parties have adequate capacity to implement the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety.</b>	Number of trained personnel in responsible ministries and agencies Budgets of responsible ministries and agencies			Too soon to assess implementation in a meaningful way		
<b>2.5 Technical and scientific cooperation is making a significant contribution to building capacity.</b>	Trends in technological and scientific cooperation Number of individuals, institutions involved in the implementation of the Convention who have benefited from technological and scientific cooperation			Yes, but insufficient and increased capacity is not always sustained	Limited human resources in many countries	Implementation of programme of work on technology transfer and cooperation
<b>Goal 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.</b>						
<b>3.1 Every Party has effective national strategies, plans and programmes in place to provide a national framework for implementing the three objectives of the Convention and to set clear national priorities.</b>	Number of Parties with NBSAPs or equivalent Number of NBSAPs that are regularly being updated National targets established within framework of VII/30 and integrated into NBSAPs	See Annex L	See Annex L	Approximately 100 out of 188 have NBSAPs, some old, some not implemented Few targets established yet	Limited capacity Limited political will	Sense of urgency associated with 2010 target

Strategic goals and objectives	Possible indicators <u>3/</u>	Areas with / examples of significant progress	Areas with / examples of little progress	Overall assessment	Obstacles <u>4/</u>	Opportunities for improving progress
<b>3.2 Every Party to the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety has a regulatory framework in place and functioning to implement the Protocol.</b>	Number of Parties to the Protocol with a regulatory framework in place and functioning to implement the Protocol			Too soon to assess implementation in a meaningful way		
<b>3.3 Biodiversity concerns are being integrated into relevant national sectoral and cross-sectoral plans, programmes and policies.</b>	% relevant national sectoral and cross-sectoral plans, programmes and policies in which biodiversity concerns are adequately integrated, including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• PRSPs</li> <li>• National plans</li> <li>• National budgets</li> </ul> Application of planning tools such as strategic environmental assessment to assess the degree to which BD concerns are being integrated	According to the second In second national reports over 70% of NBSAPs are reported to cover integration of all major sectors, including agriculture, forestry and tourism	{Awaiting input from	Probably very limited	Limited capacity Limited political will Relatively weak political profile of responsible ministries and agencies Lack of awareness or of biodiversity and its importance among relevant constituencies, vested interests and lack of incentives	
<b>3.4 The priorities in national biodiversity strategies and action plans are being actively implemented, as a means to achieve national implementation of the Convention, and as a significant contribution towards the global biodiversity agenda.</b>	Number of NBSAPs that are being actively implemented Progress towards National targets and, maybe: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• % legislation integrating biodiversity concerns</li> <li>• % impact assessments integrating biodiversity concerns</li> <li>• % incentive measures integrating biodiversity concerns</li> </ul>		Only about 10% of responding Parties indicate that they have reports on the implementation of NBSAPs	Impact unknown	Limited capacity Limited political will Relatively weak political profile of responsible ministries and agencies	
<b>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.</b>						
<b>4.1 All Parties are implementing a communication, education, and public</b>	Number of Parties implementing a CEPA strategy and promoting			Relatively few parties. Where CEPA strategies are being implemented, doubts concerning		

Strategic goals and objectives	Possible indicators <u>3</u> /	Areas with / examples of significant progress	Areas with / examples of little progress	Overall assessment	Obstacles <u>4</u> /	Opportunities for improving progress
<b>awareness strategy and promoting public participation in support of the Convention.</b>	public participation Prominence of biodiversity issues in national media Prominence of biosafety issues in formal education system			effectiveness and impacts		
<b>4.2 Every Party to the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety is promoting and facilitating public awareness, education and participation in support of the Protocol.</b>	Number of Parties to the Protocol promoting and facilitating CEPA and participation in support of the Protocol Prominence of biosafety issues in national media Prominence of biosafety issues in formal education system			Too soon to assess implementation in a meaningful way		
<b>4.3 Indigenous and local communities are effectively involved in implementation and in the processes of the Convention, at national, regional and international levels.</b>	Number of Parties with representatives of indigenous and local communities on CBD delegations Percentage of activities carried out in accordance with Akwé: Kon guidelines	Large involvement of indigenous and local communities in the Working Group on Article 8(j)	Limited involvement of indigenous and local communities in SBSTTA and some other Convention bodies & processes	Large involvement of indigenous and local communities in Convention process at international level Limited involvement at national level	Political will at national level Capacity and resources	
<b>4.4 Key actors and stakeholders, including the private sector, are engaged in partnership to implement the Convention and are integrating biodiversity concerns into their relevant sectoral and cross-sectoral plans, programmes and policies.</b>	Participation in the Global Biodiversity Partnership Type II partnerships in support of the implementation of the Convention Application of planning tools such as strategic environmental assessment to assess the degree to which biodiversity concerns are being integrated	Conservation NGOs	Private sector Consumers	While there are some positive examples, there is far too little partnership. Need to demonstrate that environmentally responsible production and consumption pays	Limited outreach activities under the Convention	Broad support for the CBD among civil society organizations Increased recognition of the business case for biodiversity Global Partnership for biodiversity

**Table 2. Prospects for attaining the 2010 subtargets agreed to under the Convention on Biological Diversity <sup>5/</sup>**

Goals and Targets	Prospects for Progress by 2010
<b>Protect the components of biodiversity</b>	
<p><b>Goal 1. Promote the conservation of the biological diversity of ecosystems, habitats, and biomes.</b></p> <p>Target 1.1: At least 10% of each of the world's ecological regions effectively conserved.</p> <p>Target 1.2: Areas of particular importance to biodiversity protected.</p>	<p>Good prospects for most terrestrial regions. Major challenge to achieve for marine regions. Difficult to provide adequate protection of inland water systems.</p>
<p><b>Goal 2. Promote the conservation of species diversity.</b></p> <p>Target 2.1: Restore, maintain, or reduce the decline of populations of species of selected taxonomic groups.</p> <p>Target 2.2: Status of threatened species improved.</p>	<p>Many species will continue to decline in abundance and distribution, but restoration and maintenance of priority species possible.</p> <p>More species will become threatened, but species-based actions will improve status of some.</p>
<p><b>Goal 3. Promote the conservation of genetic diversity.</b></p> <p>Target 3.1: Genetic diversity of crops, livestock, and harvested species of trees, fish, and wildlife and other valuable species conserved, and associated indigenous and local knowledge maintained.</p>	<p>Good prospects for ex situ conservation. Overall, agricultural systems likely to continue to be simplified. Significant losses of fish genetic diversity likely. Genetic resources in situ and traditional knowledge will be protected through some projects, but likely to decline overall.</p>
<b>Promote sustainable use</b>	
<p><b>Goal 4. Promote sustainable use and consumption.</b></p> <p>Target 4.1: Biodiversity-based products derived from sources that are sustainably managed, and production areas managed consistent with the conservation of biodiversity.</p> <p>Target 4.2: Unsustainable consumption of biological resources or that has an impact on biodiversity reduced.</p> <p>Target 4.3: No species of wild flora or fauna endangered by international trade.</p>	<p>Progress expected for some components of biodiversity. Sustainable use unlikely to be a large share of total products and production areas.</p> <p>Unsustainable consumption likely to increase.</p> <p>Progress possible, for example through implementation of the Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species of Wild Fauna and Flora.</p>
<b>Address threats to biodiversity</b>	
<p><b>Goal 5. Pressures from habitat loss, land use change and degradation, and unsustainable water use reduced.</b></p> <p>Target 5.1: Rate of loss and degradation of natural habitats decreased</p>	<p>Unlikely to reduce overall pressures in the most biodiversity-sensitive regions. However, proactive protection of some of the most important sites is possible.</p>
<b>Goal 6. Control threats from invasive alien species.</b>	

<sup>5/</sup> Adapted from the Synthesis Report "Biodiversity and Human Well-being: A synthesis report for the Convention on Biological Diversity" of the Millennium Ecosystem Assessment for an explanation of scenarios (www.maweb.org).

Goals and Targets	Prospects for Progress by 2010
<p>Target 6.1: Pathways for major potential alien invasive species controlled.</p> <p>Target 6.2: Management plans in place for major alien species that threaten ecosystems, habitats, or species.</p>	<p>Pressure is likely to increase (from greater transport, trade, and tourism, especially in <i>Global Orchestration</i> scenario). Measures to address major pathways could be put in place (especially in <i>Global Orchestration</i> and <i>Technogarden</i> scenarios).</p> <p>Management plans could be developed.</p>
<p><b>Goal 7. Address challenges to biodiversity from climate change and pollution.</b></p> <p>Target 7.1: Maintain and enhance resilience of the components of biodiversity to adapt to climate change.</p> <p>Target 7.2: Reduce pollution and its impacts on biodiversity.</p>	<p>Pressures from both climate change and pollution, especially N deposition, will increase. These increases can be mitigated under UNFCCC for climate change and through agricultural and trade policy, as well as through energy policy for nitrogen pollution. Mitigation measures include carbon sequestration through LULUCF and use of wetlands to sequester or denitrify reactive nitrogen.</p> <p>Proactive measures to reduce impacts on biodiversity possible, but challenging given other pressures.</p>
Maintain goods and services from biodiversity to support human well-being	
<p><b>Goal 8. Maintain capacity of ecosystems to deliver goods and services and support livelihoods.</b></p> <p>Target 8.1: Capacity of ecosystems to deliver goods and services maintained.</p> <p>Target 8.2: Biological resources that support sustainable livelihoods, local food security, and health care, especially of poor people, maintained.</p>	<p>Given expected increases in drivers, can probably be achieved only on a selective basis by 2010. Attainment of target 8.2 would contribute to the achievement of the MDG 2015 targets, especially targets 1, 2, and 9.</p>
Protect traditional knowledge, innovations and practices	
<p><b>Goal 9. Maintain sociocultural diversity of indigenous and local communities.</b></p> <p>Target 9.1: Protect traditional knowledge, innovations, and practices.</p> <p>Target 9.2: Protect the rights of indigenous and local communities over their traditional knowledge, innovations, and practices, including their rights to benefit sharing.</p>	<p>Possible to take measures to protect traditional knowledge and rights, but continued long-term decline in traditional knowledge likely.</p>
Ensure the fair and equitable sharing of benefits arising out of the use of genetic resources	
<p><b>Goal 10. Ensure the fair and equitable sharing of benefits arising out of the use of genetic resources.</b></p> <p>Target 10.1: All transfers of genetic resources are in line with the CBD, the International Treaty on Plant Genetic Resources for Food and Agriculture, and other applicable agreements.</p> <p>Target 10.2: Benefits arising from the commercial and other utilization of genetic resources shared with the countries providing such resources.</p>	<p>Progress is possible. In the MA scenarios, more equitable outcomes were obtained under the <i>Global Orchestration</i> and <i>Technogarden</i> scenarios, but were not achieved under <i>Order from Strength</i>.</p>
Ensure provision of adequate resources	
<p><b>Goal 11. Parties have improved financial, human, scientific, technical, and technological capacity to implement the Convention.</b></p> <p>Target 11.1: New and additional financial resources are transferred to developing-country Parties to allow for the effective implementation of their commitments under the Convention, in accordance with Article 20.</p>	<p>Progress is possible. In the MA scenarios, this outcome would be more likely under the <i>Global Orchestration</i> and <i>Technogarden</i> scenarios, but is less likely to be achieved through <i>Adapting Mosaic</i> and would not be achieved under <i>Order from Strength</i>.</p>

Goals and Targets	Prospects for Progress by 2010
Target 11.2: Technology is transferred to developing-country Parties to allow for the effective implementation of their commitments under the Convention, in accordance with Article 20.	



**Table 3: Parties with national biodiversity strategies and action plans**

(the list below also contains Parties that have submitted an interim/draft version or have finalized their NBSAP without translation into a language of the United Nations)

1. Algeria	55. Japan	112. Venezuela
2. Antigua and Barbuda	56. Kazakhstan	113. Viet Nam
3. Argentina	57. Kenya	114. Yemen
4. Armenia	58. Kyrgyzstan	115. Zambia
5. Australia	59. Latvia	116. Zimbabwe
6. Austria	60. Lebanon	
7. Bahamas	61. Liberia	<b>NBSAP Progress Reports or</b>
8. Barbados	62. Lithuania	<b>follow-up NBSAPs</b>
9. Belarus	63. Malawi	
10. Belize	64. Malaysia	1. Finland
11. Benin	65. Maldives	2. Indonesia
12. Bhutan	66. Marshall Islands	
13. Bolivia	67. Mauritania	
14. Brazil	68. Mexico	
15. Burkina Faso	69. Micronesia (Federated States of)	
16. Burundi	70. Mongolia	
17. Cambodia	71. Morocco	
18. Cameroon	72. Namibia	
19. Canada	73. Nepal	
20. Central African Republic	74. Netherlands	
21. Chad	75. New Zealand	
22. Chile	76. Nicaragua	
23. China	77. Niger	
24. Colombia	78. Niue	
25. Comoros	79. Norway	
26. Costa Rica	80. Oman	
27. Croatia	81. Pakistan	
28. Cuba	82. Panama	
29. Czech Republic	83. Paraguay	
30. Democratic People's Republic of Korea	84. Peru	
31. Democratic Republic of the Congo	85. Philippines	
32. Denmark	86. Poland	
33. Djibouti	87. Portugal	
34. Dominica	88. Republic of Korea	
35. Ecuador	89. Republic of Moldova	
36. Egypt	90. Romania	
37. El Salvador	91. Russian Federation	
38. Eritrea	92. Rwanda	
39. Estonia	93. Saint Lucia	
40. European Community	94. Samoa	
41. Finland	95. Senegal	
42. Gabon	96. Seychelles	
43. Gambia	97. Slovakia	
44. Georgia	98. Slovenia	
45. Ghana	99. Spain	
46. Grenada	100. Sri Lanka	
47. Guatemala	101. Sudan	
48. Guinea	102. Swaziland	
49. Guyana	103. Sweden	
50. Honduras	104. Tajikistan	
51. Indonesia	105. Thailand	
52. Iran (Islamic Republic of)	106. Tunisia	
53. Ireland	107. Turkmenistan	
54. Jamaica	108. Ukraine	
	109. United Kingdom	
	110. Uruguay	
	111. Uzbekistan	

**Table 4: Obstacles to the Implementation of the Convention on Biological Diversity**

**(Appendix to the Strategic Plan, Decision VI/26, annex)**

1. Political/societal obstacles
  - a. Lack of political will and support to implement the Convention on Biological Diversity
  - b. Limited public participation and stakeholder involvement
  - c. Lack of mainstreaming and integration of biodiversity issues into other sectors, including use of tools such as environmental impact assessments
  - d. Political instability
  - e. Lack of precautionary and proactive measures, causing reactive policies.
2. Institutional, technical and capacity-related obstacles
  - a. Inadequate capacity to act, caused by institutional weaknesses
  - b. Lack of human resources
  - c. Lack of transfer of technology and expertise
  - d. Loss of traditional knowledge
  - e. Lack of adequate scientific research capacities to support all the objectives.
3. Lack of accessible knowledge/information
  - a. Loss of biodiversity and the corresponding goods and services it provides not properly understood and documented
  - b. Existing scientific and traditional knowledge not fully utilized.
  - c. Dissemination of information on international and national level not efficient
  - d. Lack of public education and awareness at all levels.
4. Economic policy and financial resources
  - a. Lack of financial and human resources
  - b. Fragmentation of GEF financing
  - c. Lack of economic incentive measures
  - d. Lack of benefit-sharing.
5. Collaboration/cooperation
  - a. Lack of synergies at the national and international levels
  - b. Lack of horizontal cooperation among stakeholders
  - c. Lack of effective partnerships
  - d. Lack of engagement of scientific community.
6. Legal/juridical impediments
  - a. Lack of appropriate policies and laws
7. Socio-economic factors
  - a. Poverty
  - b. Population pressure
  - c. Unsustainable consumption and production patterns
  - d. Lack of capacities for local communities.
8. Natural phenomena and environmental change
  - a. Climate change
  - b. Natural disasters.

**Figure 1: Main direct drivers of biodiversity loss**

Main direct drivers of biodiversity loss: The cell colour indicates the impact to date of each driver on biodiversity in each biome over the past 50–100 years. The arrows indicate the trend in the impact of the driver on biodiversity. Horizontal arrows indicate a continuation of the current level of impact; diagonal and vertical arrows indicate progressively stronger increasing trends in impact.

