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CONFERENCE OF THE PARTIES TO THE CONVENTION ON BIOLOGICAL DIVERSITY

Fourteenth meeting

Sharm El-Sheikh, Egypt, 17-29 November 2018

Item 8 of the provisional agenda[[1]](#footnote-1)\*

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*

# BACKGROUND

1. In decision [X/2](https://www.cbd.int/doc/decisions/cop-10/cop-10-dec-02-en.pdf) 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](https://www.cbd.int/doc/decisions/cop-10/cop-10-dec-02-en.pdf) (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.
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 (NBSAPs), in line with the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020 and the guidance adopted in decision [IX/9](https://www.cbd.int/doc/decisions/cop-09/cop-09-dec-09-en.pdf), integrating their national targets developed in the framework of the Strategic Plan and its Aichi Biodiversity Targets into their NBSAPs. Subsequently, in decision [XII/2 A](https://www.cbd.int/doc/decisions/cop-12/cop-12-dec-02-en.pdf), 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 NBSAPs 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](https://www.cbd.int/doc/decisions/cop-12/cop-12-dec-31-en.pdf), 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.
4. In decision [XIII/1](https://www.cbd.int/doc/decisions/cop-13/cop-13-dec-01-en.pdf), the Conference of the Parties took noteof the analysis of progress towards the implementation of the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020 and the achievement of the Aichi Biodiversity Targets and of the updated report on progress towards the implementation of the [Global Strategy for Plant Conservation](https://www.cbd.int/doc/decisions/cop-10/cop-10-dec-17-en.pdf). In the same decision, the Conference of the Parties encouraged Parties, in the process of updating their NBSAPs, to consider, as appropriate, the indicators for the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020 and the indicators for the Sustainable Development Goals.
5. In the same decision, the Conference of the Parties also encouraged Parties to review their NBSAPs periodically, as appropriate and, in accordance with national circumstances, priorities and capacities, to consider increasing the level of ambition and/or scope of the national or regional targets to a level that is commensurate with the Aichi Biodiversity Targets and to integrate the targets across different sectors, including in the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development[[2]](#footnote-2) and the Sustainable Development Goals, so as to make a greater contribution to collective global efforts to achieve the global targets.
6. The Conference of the Parties further encouraged Parties to systematically mainstream gender considerations in their NBSAPs, and in associated implementation and reporting mechanisms in line with the 2015–2020 Gender Plan of Action under the Convention.[[3]](#footnote-3)
7. The present document provides an updated assessment of progress towards the 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 NBSAPs as well as the fifth national reports received by 21 September 2018. It is complemented by the following addenda:
	1. Update on progress in revising/updating and implementing national biodiversity strategies and action plans, including national targets (CBD/COP/14/5/Add.1);
	2. Analysis of the contribution of targets established by Parties and progress towards the Aichi Biodiversity Targets (CBD/COP/14/5/Add.2).
8. In addition, a further updated analysis of information provided through the financial reporting framework is provided in CBD/COP/14.
9. These analyses complement an updated scientific assessment of progress towards selected Aichi Biodiversity Targets ([CBD/SBSTTA/22/5](https://www.cbd.int/doc/c/c75f/06b1/6fc465496044698feacc47ba/sbstta-22-05-en.pdf)) considered by the Subsidiary Body on Scientific, Technical and Technological Advice at its twenty-second meeting under agenda item 6.

# REVIEW OF IMPLEMENTATION

1. The mid-term review of progress towards the implementation of the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020[[4]](#footnote-4) concluded that there had been encouraging progress towards meeting some elements of most Aichi Biodiversity Targets, but, in most cases, this progress would not be sufficient to achieve the Targets unless further urgent and effective action was taken to reduce the pressures on biodiversity and to prevent its continued decline. Additional information from updated and revised NBSAPs and from fifth national reports that were not available for consideration in the mid-term review reinforces this overall conclusion.
2. **National biodiversity strategies and action plans**
3. NBSAPs are the principal instrument for implementing the Convention at the national level. Since 1993, 190 Parties have developed at least one NBSAP, while 6 Parties have yet to submit their first.
4. 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 establishing national targets, using the Strategic Plan and its Aichi Biodiversity Targets as a flexible framework.
5. 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 69 Parties met the 2015 deadline, and 92 others submitted their NBSAPs by 21 September 2018, making a total of 161 (see annex II for the list of Parties). This represents over 80 per cent of the Parties to the Convention.
6. The update on progress in revising/updating and implementing national biodiversity strategies and action plans (CBD/COP/14/5/Add.1) summarizes progress in revising and implementing NBSAPs and national targets and analyses the contents of the post-Nagoya NSBAPs submitted by 21 September 2018. This analysis is based on criteria from decision [IX/8](https://www.cbd.int/doc/decisions/cop-09/cop-09-dec-08-en.pdf) which provides detailed guidance on the process, contents and components of NBSAPs and subsequent guidance. It indicates that many of the revised NBSAPs show substantial improvement over previous NBSAPs as reflected in the global assessment undertaken in 2010,[[5]](#footnote-5) in terms of their legal status, their building on assessments of their predecessor documents, the engagement of other government ministries and other criteria.
7. 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 52 revised NBSAPs have been adopted as “whole-of-government” instruments and another 6 NBSAPs have been adopted as instruments applying to the environmental sector. While 17 other countries stated their intent to have their NBSAP adopted as a policy instrument, the majority (86 Parties, equivalent to 53 per cent) do not provide sufficient evidence to know if they have been adopted as a policy instrument.
8. The analysis also shows that few of the revised NBSAPs contain resource mobilization strategies (24 Parties), communication and public awareness strategies (35 Parties), or capacity development strategies (19 Parties) 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. Revised NBSAPs bear little evidence of the use of valuation studies to encourage mainstreaming in countries.
9. 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, and development of subnational biodiversity plans, among other topics.
10. 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, 17 and 18, there were many NBSAPs (over 30 per cent) without associated national targets or commitments. Aichi Biodiversity Targets 1, 9, 16, 19 and 20 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 20 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.
11. Many countries have established targets or made commitments within 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 to the Paris Agreement,[[6]](#footnote-6) many countries have 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 NBSAPs. 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.
12. In decision X/2, the Conference of the Parties 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 NBSAPs is contained in documents CBD/COP/14/5/Add.1 and Add.2.
13. **National reports**
14. In adopting the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020,[[7]](#footnote-7) 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](https://www.cbd.int/doc/decisions/cop-10/cop-10-dec-10-en.pdf), the Conference of the Parties requested Parties to submit their fifth national report by 31 March 2014. By 21 September 2018, 191 fifth national reports had been received (that is, all the Parties except the Bahamas, Gabon, Iceland, Lesotho and Libya, or 97 per cent of Parties).[[8]](#footnote-8)
15. Information contained in these reports on the status, trends and pressures related to 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 indicates 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.
16. Across all Aichi Biodiversity Targets, between one third and two thirds 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 Targets, between 7 and 43 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 3 and 29 per cent depending on the target. Overall, the assessment of information in the national reports indicates that between 63 and 86 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 2 per cent 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 CBD/COP/14/5/Add.2.

# CONCLUSION

1. 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 Targets are to be met and the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020 more generally is to be successfully implemented.
2. 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.

*Annex I*

# List of FIFTH national reports received by the Secretariat of the Convention on Biological Diversity by 21 September 2018

1. Afghanistan
2. Albania
3. Algeria
4. Andorra
5. Angola
6. Antigua and Barbuda
7. Argentina
8. Armenia
9. Australia
10. Austria
11. Azerbaijan
12. Bahrain
13. Bangladesh
14. Barbados
15. Belarus
16. Belgium
17. Belize
18. Benin
19. Bhutan
20. Bolivia (Plurinational State of)
21. Bosnia and Herzegovina
22. Botswana
23. Brazil
24. Brunei Darussalam
25. Bulgaria
26. Burkina Faso
27. Burundi
28. Cabo Verde
29. Cambodia
30. Cameroon
31. Canada
32. Central African Republic
33. Chad
34. Chile
35. China
36. Colombia
37. Comoros
38. Congo
39. Cook Islands
40. Costa Rica
41. Côte d’Ivoire
42. Croatia
43. Cuba
44. Cyprus
45. Czechia
46. Democratic People’s Republic of Korea
47. Democratic Republic of the Congo
48. Denmark
49. Djibouti
50. Dominica
51. Dominican Republic
52. Ecuador
53. Egypt
54. El Salvador
55. Equatorial Guinea
56. Eritrea
57. Eswatini
58. Estonia
59. Ethiopia
60. European Union
61. Fiji
62. Finland
63. France
64. Gambia
65. Georgia
66. Germany
67. Ghana
68. Greece
69. Grenada
70. Guatemala
71. Guinea
72. Guinea-Bissau
73. Guyana
74. Haiti
75. Honduras
76. Hungary
77. India
78. Indonesia
79. Iran (Islamic Republic of)
80. Iraq
81. Ireland
82. Israel
83. Italy
84. Jamaica
85. Japan
86. Jordan
87. Kazakhstan
88. Kenya
89. Kiribati
90. Kuwait
91. Kyrgyzstan
92. Lao People’s Democratic Republic
93. Latvia
94. Lebanon
95. Liberia
96. Liechtenstein
97. Lithuania
98. Luxembourg
99. Madagascar
100. Malawi
101. Malaysia
102. Maldives
103. Mali
104. Malta
105. Marshall Islands
106. Mauritania
107. Mauritius
108. Mexico
109. Micronesia (Federated States of)
110. Monaco
111. Mongolia
112. Montenegro
113. Morocco
114. Mozambique
115. Myanmar
116. Namibia
117. Nauru
118. Nepal
119. Netherlands
120. New Zealand
121. Nicaragua
122. Niger
123. Nigeria
124. Niue
125. Norway
126. Oman
127. Pakistan
128. Palau
129. Panama
130. Papua New Guinea
131. Paraguay
132. Peru
133. Philippines
134. Poland
135. Portugal
136. Qatar
137. Republic of Korea
138. Republic of Moldova
139. Romania
140. Russian Federation
141. Rwanda
142. Saint Kitts and Nevis
143. Saint Lucia
144. Saint Vincent and the Grenadines
145. Samoa
146. San Marino
147. Sao Tome and Principe
148. Saudi Arabia
149. Senegal
150. Serbia
151. Seychelles
152. Sierra Leone
153. Singapore
154. Slovakia
155. Slovenia
156. Solomon Islands
157. Somalia
158. South Africa
159. South Sudan
160. Spain
161. Sri Lanka
162. State of Palestine
163. Sudan
164. Suriname
165. Sweden
166. Switzerland
167. Syrian Arab Republic
168. Tajikistan
169. Thailand
170. The former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia
171. Timor-Leste
172. Togo
173. Tonga
174. Trinidad and Tobago
175. Tunisia
176. Turkey
177. Turkmenistan
178. Tuvalu
179. Uganda
180. Ukraine
181. United Arab Emirates
182. United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland
183. United Republic of Tanzania
184. Uruguay
185. Uzbekistan
186. Vanuatu
187. Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of)
188. Viet Nam
189. Yemen
190. Zambia
191. 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 21 September 2018

1. Afghanistan
2. Albania
3. Algeria
4. Andorra
5. Antigua and Barbuda
6. Argentina
7. Armenia
8. Australia
9. Austria
10. Azerbaijan
11. Bahrain
12. Bangladesh
13. Belarus
14. Belgium
15. Belize
16. Benin
17. Bhutan
18. Bosnia and Herzegovina
19. Botswana
20. Brazil
21. Brunei Darussalam
22. Burkina Faso
23. Burundi
24. Cabo Verde
25. Cambodia
26. Cameroon
27. Canada
28. Chad
29. Chile
30. China
31. Colombia
32. Comoros
33. Congo
34. Costa Rica
35. Côte d’Ivoire
36. Croatia
37. Cuba
38. Czechia
39. Democratic People’s Republic of Korea
40. Democratic Republic of the Congo
41. Denmark
42. Djibouti
43. Dominica
44. Dominican Republic
45. Ecuador
46. Egypt
47. El Salvador
48. Equatorial Guinea
49. Eritrea
50. Eswatini
51. Estonia
52. Ethiopia
53. European Union
54. Finland
55. France
56. Gambia
57. Georgia
58. Germany
59. Ghana
60. Greece
61. Grenada
62. Guatemala
63. Guinea
64. Guinea-Bissau
65. Guyana
66. Honduras
67. Hungary
68. India
69. Indonesia
70. Iran (Islamic Republic of)
71. Iraq
72. Ireland
73. Italy
74. Jamaica
75. Japan
76. Jordan
77. Kiribati
78. Kyrgyzstan
79. Lao People’s Democratic Republic
80. Latvia
81. Lebanon
82. Liberia
83. Liechtenstein
84. Lithuania
85. Luxembourg
86. Madagascar
87. Malawi
88. Malaysia
89. Maldives
90. Mali
91. Malta
92. Mauritania
93. Mauritius
94. Mexico
95. Mongolia
96. Montenegro
97. Morocco
98. Mozambique
99. Myanmar
100. Namibia
101. Nauru
102. Nepal
103. Netherlands
104. New Zealand
105. Nicaragua
106. Niger
107. Nigeria
108. Niue
109. Norway
110. Pakistan
111. Palau
112. Paraguay
113. Peru
114. Philippines
115. Poland
116. Portugal
117. Qatar
118. Republic of Korea
119. Republic of Moldova
120. Romania
121. Russian Federation
122. Rwanda
123. Saint Kitts and Nevis
124. Samoa
125. Saint Vincent and the Grenadines
126. San Marino
127. Sao Tome and Principe
128. Senegal
129. Serbia
130. Seychelles
131. Sierra Leone
132. Slovakia
133. Solomon Islands
134. Somalia
135. South Africa
136. Spain
137. Sri Lanka
138. Sudan
139. Suriname
140. Sweden
141. Switzerland
142. Tajikistan
143. Thailand
144. Timor-Leste
145. Togo
146. Trinidad and Tobago
147. Tunisia
148. Turkmenistan
149. Tuvalu
150. Uganda
151. Ukraine
152. United Arab Emirates
153. United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland
154. United Republic of Tanzania
155. Uruguay
156. Vanuatu
157. Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of)
158. Viet Nam
159. Yemen
160. Zambia
161. Zimbabwe

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

1. \* CBD/COP/14/1. [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. [General Assembly resolution 70/1](http://www.un.org/en/ga/search/view_doc.asp?symbol=A/RES/70/1), annex. [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
3. Decision [XII/7](https://www.cbd.int/doc/decisions/cop-12/cop-12-dec-07-en.pdf). [↑](#footnote-ref-3)
4. The midterm review of progress was supported by the fourth edition of the *Global Biodiversity Outlook* and led to the adoption of decision XII/1. [↑](#footnote-ref-4)
5. [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](http://archive.ias.unu.edu/resource_centre/UNU-IAS_Biodiversity_Planning_NBSAPs_Assessment_final_web_Oct_2010.pdf). [↑](#footnote-ref-5)
6. United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change, Conference of the Parties, twenty-first session, [decision 1/CP.21](https://unfccc.int/sites/default/files/resource/docs/2015/cop21/eng/10a01.pdf). [↑](#footnote-ref-6)
7. Decision X/2. [↑](#footnote-ref-7)
8. See annex I for the list of Parties. [↑](#footnote-ref-8)