



Convention on Biological Diversity

Distr.
GENERAL

CBD/COP/15/9
30 October 2022

ORIGINAL: ENGLISH

CONFERENCE OF THE PARTIES TO THE
CONVENTION ON BIOLOGICAL DIVERSITY
Fifteenth meeting - Part II
Montreal, Canada, 7-19 December 2022
Agenda item 8

REVIEW OF PROGRESS IN THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE CONVENTION AND THE STRATEGIC PLAN FOR BIODIVERSITY 2011-2020

Note by the Executive Secretary

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 the Parties to assess the contribution of such national and regional targets to the global targets. In response to this decision and related subsequent decisions,¹ the Conference of the Parties at each of its meetings since its tenth meeting has reviewed progress in the implementation the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020 on the basis, among other things, of the national reports and national biodiversity strategies and action plans (NBSAPs).²
2. In decision 14/1, the Conference of the Parties encouraged Parties to submit the sixth national report in a timely manner, and requested the Executive Secretary to continue to update the analysis of progress towards the implementation of the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity-2011-2020 on the basis of information contained in the sixth national reports, which should be submitted by 31 December 2018, and to make the updated analysis available for consideration by the Subsidiary Body on Implementation at its third meeting. Further, in decision 14/18, the Conference of the Parties requested the Executive Secretary to undertake a review of the implementation of the 2015-2020 Gender Plan of Action in order to identify gaps, best practices and lessons learned. These analyses were presented to the Subsidiary Body on Implementation at its third meeting and on this basis the Subsidiary Body prepared its recommendation 3/1.
3. The present document provides an update to the assessment of progress towards the implementation of the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020 presented to the Subsidiary Body on Implementation at its third meeting (CBD/SBI/3/2 and its four addenda). It is primarily based on information contained in the revised and updated NBSAPs as well as the sixth national reports received by October 2022. This analysis

¹ For example 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, according to the list of issues contained in the annex to this decision, the Conference of the Parties at its thirteenth meeting was to undertake, among other things, an interim 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.

² See decisions XI/3, XII/1, XIII/1 and 14/1.

is complemented by two addenda, one providing an update on progress in revising/updating and implementing national biodiversity strategies and action plans (CBD/COP/15/9/Add.1) and the other providing an analysis of the contribution of targets established by Parties and progress towards the Aichi Biodiversity Targets (CBD/COP/15/9/Add.2).

4. The present document also contains updated information on Aichi Biodiversity Targets 6, 11, 16 and 20, where there have been recent assessments or updates since the fifth edition of the *Global Biodiversity Outlook* was published. However, the overall messages presented in the Outlook remain valid. A summary of progress in the implementation of the Cartagena Protocol is also provided. Information on the progress towards Aichi Biodiversity Target 18 and the 2015-2020 Gender Plan of Action is also included in the present document. However, in the latter two cases, these same assessments were previously presented to the Subsidiary Body on Implementation in document CBD/SBI/3/2 and have been included here, without changes, for ease of reference.

I. UPDATING NATIONAL BIODIVERSITY STRATEGIES AND ACTION PLANS AND SETTING NATIONAL TARGETS

5. NBSAPs are the principal instrument for implementing the Convention at the national level. Since 1993, 193 Parties have developed at least one NBSAP. 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. Parties also committed to establishing national targets, using the Strategic Plan and its Aichi Biodiversity Targets as a flexible framework. Further, 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. A total of 69 Parties met the 2015 deadline set out in Aichi Biodiversity Target 17, and 108 others submitted their NBSAPs by 17 October 2022, making a total of 177.³ This represents 90 per cent of the Parties to the Convention. Support and resources for the development and revision/update of the NBSAPs was provided by several organizations, including the Global Environment Facility, the United Nations Development Programme, the United Nations Environment Programme, the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations and the Inter-American Development Bank. A number of Parties, including Japan, through the Japan Biodiversity Fund, also provided support for NBSAP revisions and implementation processes, and for the voluntary peer review of NBSAP implementation. A number of non-governmental organizations, including the ASEAN Centre for Biodiversity, Birdlife, the International Union for Conservation of Nature, the United Nations University Institute for the Advanced Study of Sustainability and the World Wildlife Fund (WWF), have also provided support to Parties in the development and revision/update of NBSAPs.

6. The updated analysis of NBSAPs presented in document CBD/COP/15/9/Add.1 summarizes progress in preparing or revising NBSAPs and analyses the contents of the post-Nagoya NBSAPs. This analysis is based on the criteria from decision IX/8 which provides detailed guidance on the process, contents and components of NBSAPs. The analysis suggests improvement, particularly with regard to the range of stakeholders involved in the NBSAP process, over the first generation of NBSAPs as reflected in the global assessment undertaken in 2010.⁴ However, it also points to areas where further progress is needed.

7. The analysis found that 73 revised NBSAPs have been adopted as “whole-of-government” instruments and another 9 NBSAPs have been adopted as instruments applying to the environmental sector. However, 75 Parties (38 per cent) do not provide sufficient evidence to know if their NBSAPs have been adopted as a policy instrument or not. The analysis also shows that few NBSAPs contain resource mobilization strategies (25 Parties), communication and public awareness strategies (39 Parties), or capacity development strategies (107 Parties) as the NBSAP guidance recommends. Further, only a few NBSAPs demonstrate that biodiversity is being mainstreamed significantly into cross-sectoral plans and policies, poverty eradication policies, or into sustainable development plans. NBSAPs prepared since the adoption of

³ The subsequent analysis is based on the 167 NBSAPs that were submitted in one of the official languages of the United Nations.

⁴ [Prip, C; Gross, T; Johnston, S; Vierros, M \(2010\). *Biodiversity Planning: An Assessment of National Biodiversity Strategies and Action Plans*. United Nations University Institute of Advanced Studies, Yokohama, Japan.](#)

the current Strategic Plan for Biodiversity contain little evidence of the use of valuation studies to encourage mainstreaming in countries. These findings contrast significantly with the aspirations communicated in the NBSAPs which indicate that many Parties have either set targets or otherwise stated an intent to implement actions on resource mobilization, valuation, the establishment of a national clearing-house mechanism, communication and public awareness, capacity development, and development of subnational biodiversity plans, among other topics.

8. The majority of NBSAPs prepared 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, and 14, there are many NBSAPs (over 30 per cent) without associated national targets or commitments. Aichi Biodiversity Targets 1, 9, 16, 17, 19 and 20 were 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 was on average just over a fifth (22 per cent) (ranging from 19 per cent for Aichi Targets 16 and 17 to 28 per cent for Aichi Biodiversity Target 1). 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. These conclusions are consistent with the analysis made available during the first, second and third meetings of the Subsidiary Body on Implementation⁵ and the thirteenth and fourteenth meetings of the Conference of the Parties to the Convention on Biological Diversity.⁶ They suggest that the national and regional targets, which have been adopted do not collectively add up to the level of ambition set out in the Aichi Biodiversity Targets.

II. PROGRESS IN IMPLEMENTING THE STRATEGIC PLAN – INFORMATION FROM NATIONAL REPORTS

9. The national reports are a main source of information for assessing implementation of the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity. 23 per cent of Parties submitted their sixth national reports before or by the deadline of 31 December 2018 agreed by the Conference of the Parties. Six months after the deadline, 49 per cent of Parties had submitted their reports. By October 2022, 185 sixth national reports had been received. The assessment of the information submitted in the sixth national reports indicates that the majority of Parties have made progress towards the Aichi Targets but not at a rate that has allowed them to be met.

10. A third of national targets are on track to be met (30 per cent) or exceeded (3 per cent). However, less than a tenth (9 per cent) of the national target that are similar to an Aichi Biodiversity Target are on track to be met. On average, for about half of the national targets (51 per cent) progress is being made but not at a rate that will allow them to be met. Further, on average, about a tenth of national targets have no significant progress (10 per cent) or are moving in the wrong direction (1 per cent). Most progress appears to have been made towards the national targets related to Aichi Biodiversity Targets 1, 11, 16, 17 and 19. By comparison much less progress appears to have been made towards the national targets related to Aichi Biodiversity Targets 5, 8, 9, 10, 13, 14 and 20.

11. This assessment is consistent with that presented in the fourth and fifth editions of the *Global Biodiversity Outlook*, which concluded that, while progress was being made towards the achievement of all targets, it was not sufficient to achieve the Aichi Biodiversity Targets. It is also consistent with the *Global Assessment Report on Biodiversity and Ecosystem Services* of the Intergovernmental Science-Policy Platform on Biodiversity and Ecosystem Services, which observed that “the implementation of policy responses and actions to conserve nature and manage it more sustainably has progressed, yielding positive outcomes relative to scenarios of no intervention, but progress is not sufficient to stem the direct and indirect drivers of nature deterioration. It is therefore likely that most of the Aichi Biodiversity Targets for 2020 will be missed.”

⁵ See [UNEP/CBD/SBI/1/2/Add.2](#) and [UNEP/CBD/SBI/2/2/Add.2](#).

⁶ [UNEP/CBD/COP/13/8/Add.2/Rev.1](#) and [CBD/COP/14/5/Add.2](#).

III. PROGRESS TOWARDS SELECTED AICHI BIODIVERSITY TARGETS

12. The assessment contained in the fifth edition of the *Global Biodiversity Outlook* (GBO-5) continues to be the most up-to-date assessment of implementation of the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020. The overall conclusions in the Outlook continue to be relevant. However, for a few of the Aichi Biodiversity Targets more up-to-date information has become available since GBO-5 was published.

A. Aichi Biodiversity Target 6

13. The 2022 edition of *The State of World Fisheries and Aquaculture*⁷ by the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations concluded that the proportion of fish stocks within biologically sustainable levels in 2019 was 64.6 per cent, 1.2 per cent lower than in 2017. This decline is the result of continued overfishing, pollution, poor management and other factors. However, there has also been a 3.8 per cent increase in the number of landings coming from biologically sustainable stocks between 2017 and 2019, with 82.5 per cent of landings coming from such stocks. The same report forecasts that aquatic animal production will increase 14 per cent by 2030, reaching 202 million tonnes. This growth is expected to be largely driven by the expansion of aquaculture which is anticipated to reach 106 million tonnes by 2030 (also relevant to Aichi Target 7). In addition, world capture fisheries are projected to reach 96 million tonnes by 2030 due to improved resource management, growth in catches of underfished resources, and reduced discards, waste and losses.

B. Aichi Biodiversity Target 11

14. As of October 2022, the percentage of terrestrial and inland water areas covered by protected areas and other effective area-based conservation measures (OECMs) reached almost 17 per cent (15.8 per cent protected areas and 1.2 per cent OECMs). In the marine realm, 8.3 per cent of marine area is covered by protected areas and OECMs (18.7 per cent of exclusive economic zones, 1.4 per cent of areas beyond national jurisdiction). Of this 8.3 per cent, the large majority is covered by protected areas (8.2 per cent under protected areas and 0.1 per cent under OECMs). The coverage by protected areas and OECMs is thus close to the 17 per cent value set out in Aichi Target 11 for terrestrial and inland water areas and the 10 per cent value set out for coastal and marine areas. When additional commitments are taken into account these values would be exceeded.

C. Aichi Biodiversity Target 16 and the Nagoya Protocol on Access and Benefit-sharing

15. Aichi Biodiversity Target 16 provides that by 2015, the Nagoya Protocol on Access to Genetic Resources and the Fair and Equitable Sharing of Benefits Arising from their Utilization (ABS) is in force and operational, consistent with national legislation. After the adoption of the Nagoya Protocol in 2010, it entered into force on 12 October 2014, marking the achievement of the first part of Aichi Target 16. The Protocol has currently been ratified, accepted, or acceded to by 138 Parties,⁸ thus exceeding two thirds of the Parties to the Convention. It is possible that Aichi Target 16 was very helpful in promoting the ratification and implementation of the Nagoya Protocol.⁹

16. Regarding the second part of Aichi Target 16, further efforts are required for the Protocol to be operational at the national level, through establishing the required institutional structures and legal, administrative or policy measures at the national level and publishing required information on the ABS Clearing-House. With regard to institutional structures, 134 out of the 138 Parties to the Protocol (97 per cent) have designated ABS national focal points and 89 Parties (65 per cent) have designated one or more competent national authorities responsible for responding to requests for access to genetic resources and/or

⁷ FAO. 2022. *The State of World Fisheries and Aquaculture 2022. Towards Blue Transformation*. Rome, FAO. <https://doi.org/10.4060/cc0461en>.

⁸ As of 1 August 2022.

⁹ Report of the Global Consultation on the Post-2020 Global Biodiversity Framework in Relation to Access and Benefit-sharing and the Nagoya Protocol, CBD/POST2020/WS/2019/8/3.

associated traditional knowledge. However, only 43 Parties (31 per cent) have designated one or more checkpoints to help monitor the utilization of genetic resources. With regard to regulatory requirements, 102 Parties to the Protocol (74 per cent) have established at least one legislative, administrative or policy measure on ABS.¹⁰ Many Parties also still need to make information available regarding their institutional structures, ABS measures, permits as appropriate, as well as information collected at checkpoints as appropriate, to the ABS Clearing-House as required by the Protocol.

17. The first assessment and review of the effectiveness of the Nagoya Protocol considered the status of implementation of the provisions of the Protocol. While welcoming the progress made by Parties, the Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Nagoya Protocol found that further work was needed, as a priority, to develop ABS legislation or regulatory requirements, to enhance implementation of the provisions of the Protocol relating to compliance, to support the full and effective participation of indigenous peoples and local communities in implementation, and to raise awareness among relevant stakeholders.¹¹

D. Aichi Biodiversity Target 18¹²

18. In decision 14/1, the Conference of the Parties welcomed the updated analysis of progress¹³ in the implementation of the Convention and the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020 and towards the achievement of the Aichi Biodiversity Targets. Specifically, with regard to Target 18, the Conference of the Parties urged Parties, in accordance with national circumstances and as appropriate, to increase efforts in the protection of and respect for traditional knowledge. Some progress has been made in implementing Article 8(j) of the Convention and in raising awareness about the role of traditional knowledge, customary sustainable use and indigenous peoples and local communities in the context of Aichi Biodiversity Target 18 during the current biennium. However, increased awareness has not been translated into action and not all aspects of the target have been met (a detailed analysis of progress towards Aichi Biodiversity Target 18 is contained in document CBD/SBI/3/2/Add.4 and in the fifth edition of the *Global Biodiversity Outlook*).

19. In comparison with the fifth national reports, the sixth national reports show a significant increase in information about the implementation of Aichi Target 18 and the contribution of traditional knowledge and collective actions of indigenous peoples and local communities to the achievement of other targets. Only 27 per cent of the fifth national reports mentioned indigenous peoples and local communities, whereas about 60 per cent of the sixth national reports did so.¹⁴ This represents a more than threefold increase in reporting on the collective actions of indigenous peoples and local communities, including traditional knowledge, customary sustainable use and traditional agriculture, through the national reports. There is also ample evidence that capacity-building programmes with a focus on traditional knowledge, bringing together Parties with indigenous peoples and local communities, have contributed to raising awareness about the contribution of indigenous peoples and local communities and assisted in the implementation of Aichi Target 18 at the national and local levels. However, only 16 Parties (10 per cent) mention the engagement of indigenous peoples and local communities in NBSAP processes. An additional challenge to assessing the implementation of Target 18 is that very few Parties have addressed all elements of the target in their national

¹⁰ As of 1 August 2022, based on information contained in records published to the ABS Clearing-House, interim national reports on the implementation of the Nagoya Protocol, as well as in national biodiversity strategies and action plans (NBSAPs) and national reports under the Convention.

¹¹ Decision NP-3/1, paras. 4-5.

¹² This text is unchanged from what was presented to the third meeting of the Subsidiary Body on Implementation in document CBD/SBI/3/2 and complemented by CBD/SBI/3/2/Add.4.

¹³ CBD/COP/14/5, Add.1 and Add.2.

¹⁴ This analysis is based on information from 150 sixth national reports.

targets. Furthermore, Parties have not adopted or made use of national indicators commensurate with the four traditional knowledge indicators noted in decision XIII/28 in order to measure progress.¹⁵

E. Aichi Biodiversity Target 20

20. The fifth edition of the *Global Biodiversity Outlook*, on the basis of multiple lines of evidence, concluded that Aichi Target 20 had been partially met. The report noted that there had been increases in domestic resources for biodiversity in some countries, with resources remaining broadly constant for others over the past decade. Evidence at that time (data up to 2018) suggested that financial resources available for biodiversity through international flows and official development assistance had roughly doubled. However, trends in domestic resources mobilization were variable across countries, and when all sources of biodiversity finance were taken into account, the increase in biodiversity financing did not appear to be sufficient in relation to needs.

21. As of 5 September 2022, 97 Parties, or about half of the Parties to the Convention, have provided information through the revised financial reporting framework adopted in decision XII/3. However, only 51 of those Parties have provided information on further progress to 2020.

22. The information provided by Parties indicates that several Parties achieved or surpassed a doubling of total biodiversity-related international financial resources in the period covered by the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity (one Party doubled in 2014, ten Parties in 2015, one Party in 2016, three Parties in 2017 and one in 2018) and several of these maintained the doubling in some years. Overall, however, information provided through the financial reporting framework suggests that Parties have not collectively achieved the doubling target, notwithstanding the more positive picture resulting from the Rio marker data of the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development.

23. Approximately half of reporting Parties have included biodiversity in their national priorities and development plans and more than 90 per cent of them have reported their domestic biodiversity-related expenditures. Almost 60 per cent of reporting Parties have reported their funding needs, gaps and priorities, 90 per cent of them have undertaken assessments of the various values of biodiversity, and more than half (55 per cent) provide at least some information on their national finance plans or elements thereof.

24. With regard to domestic biodiversity-related expenditures, about half of reporting Parties where a trend can be detected, report an increasing trend until 2015 while the remaining report no increase or declines. The information provided through the financial reporting framework indicates, that while progress has been made towards the targets for resource mobilization under Aichi Target 20, Parties collectively have not achieved them. Further information on this analysis, including the methodology used and its limitations, is contained in document CBD/COP/15/11.

IV. PROGRESS IN IMPLEMENTING THE CARTAGENA PROTOCOL ON BIOSAFETY

25. The Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety was adopted further to paragraph 3 of Article 19 of the Convention. The Protocol entered into force on 11 September 2003. Since the adoption of the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020, the number of Parties to the Cartagena Protocol has increased from 161 to 173.

26. In 2010, the Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Cartagena Protocol adopted the Strategic Plan for the Cartagena Protocol for the period 2011-2020.¹⁶ A mid-term evaluation of the Strategic Plan took place in 2016, in conjunction with the third assessment and review of the effectiveness of the Protocol. The Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Protocol, at its tenth meeting,

¹⁵ Indicators: (a) Trends of linguistic diversity and numbers of speakers of indigenous languages; (b) Trends in land-use change and land tenure in the traditional territories of indigenous and local communities; (c) Trends in the practice of traditional occupations; and (d) Trends in degree to which traditional knowledge and practices are respected through: full integration, participation and safeguards in national implementation of the Strategic Plan.

¹⁶ Decision BS-V/16.

will carry out the final evaluation of the Strategic Plan for the Protocol, in conjunction with the fourth assessment and review of the effectiveness of the Protocol.

27. The results of the fourth assessment and review of the Protocol¹⁷ and the final evaluation of the Strategic Plan show that just over half of the Parties (55 per cent) reported having fully taken the necessary measures to implement the Protocol (as required by Article 2(1)) of the Protocol), while 38 per cent had done so partially.

28. The assessment and review showed a positive trend in sharing information through the Biosafety Clearing-House (BCH). The number of submissions to the BCH, including decisions, more than doubled since 2010.

29. Almost two thirds of Parties undertook risk assessment of living modified organisms (LMOs) pursuant to the Protocol. For 96 per cent of decisions published in the BCH, risk assessment reports are available, which constitutes a considerable increase since 2010. Almost all Parties to the Protocol reported that laboratory personnel have been trained in the detection of LMOs.

30. The findings of the fourth assessment and review of the effectiveness of the Cartagena Protocol and final evaluation of the Strategic Plan for the Protocol are being taken into consideration in the development of the post-2020 implementation plan and capacity-building action plan for the Protocol, which are expected to be adopted by the Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Protocol at its tenth meeting.¹⁸

31. The Nagoya – Kuala Lumpur Supplementary Protocol on Liability and Redress was adopted on 15 October 2010 as a supplementary agreement to the Cartagena Protocol. It entered into force on 5 March 2018. The Supplementary Protocol currently has 51 Parties.

V. PROGRESS IN IMPLEMENTING THE GENDER PLAN OF ACTION¹⁹

32. In decision XII/7, the Conference of the Parties welcomed the 2015-2020 Gender Plan of Action under the Convention on Biological Diversity, and requested the Executive Secretary to support its implementation and requested Parties to report on actions taken in this regard. The review of implementation of the Gender Plan of Action presented in document CBD/SBI/3/2/Add.3, was undertaken in response to decision 14/18, and assesses actions undertaken by Parties and the Secretariat, and identifies best practices, lessons learned and gaps. The review is based on assessment of the sixth national reports²⁰ received by the Secretariat, and results of two global surveys, one for government representatives, and one for other relevant organizations.²¹

33. The review suggests that there is an enhanced awareness and understanding among Parties of gender and biodiversity linkages and the relevant steps that need to be taken to enable a more gender-responsive implementation of actions to halt biodiversity loss. However, the efforts of Parties need to be maintained and strengthened, including in areas of women's full and effective engagement in implementation and mainstreaming of gender issues in biodiversity-related actions, better coordination with women's organizations and ministries and local partners, as well as awareness-raising and capacity-building for different actors, among other areas to ensure stronger and sustained outcomes for gender and biodiversity going forward.

34. Best practices identified in the implementation of the Gender Plan of Action include specific actions to integrate gender considerations more effectively in biodiversity policy frameworks, identifying links between, and making use of, data and statistics available from different processes, to overcome gender gaps in biodiversity-related sectors, and approaches to raise awareness, build capacity and share learning to support

¹⁷ CBD/SBI/3/3.

¹⁸ Recommendation SBI-3/4.

¹⁹ This text is unchanged from what was presented to the third meeting of the Subsidiary Body on Implementation in document CBD/SBI/3/2 and complemented by CBD/SBI/3/2/Add.3.

²⁰ Sixth national reports received by the Secretariat up to and including 8 November 2019 were considered in this assessment. A total of 126 reports were reviewed.

²¹ "Other relevant organizations" refers to international organizations, civil society organizations and other relevant organizations working to achieve the objectives of the Convention, at international, regional, national and local scales.

equitable engagement of women in biodiversity-related sectors. Lessons learned point to the value of the Gender Plan of Action as a policy/advocacy tool, the need for clear, actionable and measurable gender-biodiversity objectives to support implementation, long-term investment and concerted action, and the need to build on project results to strengthen action at larger scales. The review identified a number of gaps, or areas requiring further attention, related to enhancing national implementation of the plan. These include the need for further capacity development, the collection and analysis of sex-disaggregated data, as well as adequate financing and reporting.

35. Overall the review suggests that a new gender plan of action or strategy, along with measurable targets and appropriate indicators, will be needed to support the implementation of a gender-responsive post-2020 global biodiversity framework. Findings also indicate that the development of a post-2020 gender plan of action or strategy should follow a consultative and participatory process, which engages Parties and relevant organizations and stakeholders. The review also found that gender-responsive implementation in the post-2020 period will require gender to be fully mainstreamed in NBSAPs, integrated in the post-2020 review process, and addressed in national reporting.

VI. CONCLUSION

36. The review of progress undertaken in the present document and its addenda constitutes the last opportunity for the Conference of the Parties to take stock of the implementation of the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020. The formats, information included, and the timing of submissions of the NBSAPs have made their assessment challenging. Parties have taken different approaches with regard to the establishment of their national targets as well as how they have reported against them. These different approaches have limited the ability to aggregate and compare the information received. Further, the delays in submitting national reports and NBSAPs to the Secretariat has reduced the time available for their review and reflection in relevant documentation. Parties may wish to give further consideration to these issues during their discussions under agenda items 9 (the post-2020 global biodiversity framework) and 14 (mechanisms for reporting, assessment and review of implementation).

37. The NBSAPs and the national reports, two complementary sources of information, indicate that 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, the assessment of these indicates that in the aggregate, gaps exist in relation to the level of ambition of the national targets set to reach the Aichi Biodiversity Targets, as well as in the efforts to reach them. This assessment is consistent with earlier assessments, including the fourth and fifth editions of the *Global Biodiversity Outlook* and the *IPBES Global Assessment on Biodiversity and Ecosystem Services*, as well as previous reviews by the Conference of the Parties, which concluded that, while progress was being made towards the achievement of all targets, it would not be sufficient to achieve the Aichi Biodiversity Targets by 2020. Recent assessment and analysis that have become available since the publication of the *Global Biodiversity Outlook* and the *IPBES Global Assessment on Biodiversity and Ecosystem Services* further support the conclusion that while progress has been made, biodiversity continues to decline globally.
