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SUBSIDIARY BODY ON IMPLEMENTATION

Second meeting

Montreal, Canada, 9-13 July 2018

Item 3 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 14 March 2018. It is complimented by the following addenda:
	1. Update and analysis of national biodiversity strategies and action plans received after the adoption of the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020 (CBD/SBI/2/2/Add.1);
	2. Analysis of the contribution of targets established by Parties and progress towards the Aichi Biodiversity Targets (CBD/SBI/2/2/Add.2);
	3. Progress in the implementation of the 2015-2020 Gender Plan of Action (CBD/SBI/2/2/Add.3).
8. Additional assessments of progress towards individual Aichi Biodiversity Targets are being discussed under other agenda items. They include:
	1. An analysis of progress in achieving the milestones for the full implementation of Aichi Biodiversity Target 3, contained in CBD/SBI/2/8 and the accompanying information note, considered under agenda item 9;
	2. A stocktaking and updated analysis of progress against the targets for resource mobilization, under Aichi Biodiversity Target 20, based on financial reporting frameworks received from Parties ([CBD/SBI/2/8/Add.1](https://www.cbd.int/doc/c/9f63/8ad3/2aab7f3f33590decf1a320e0/sbi-02-08-add1-en.pdf)), also considered under agenda item 9;
	3. Elements of methodological guidance for identifying, monitoring, and assessing the contribution of indigenous peoples and local communities to the achievement of the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020 and the Aichi Biodiversity Targets ([CBD/SBI/2/19](https://www.cbd.int/doc/c/3918/cd75/314abbf6deefd40b372e9a42/sbi-02-19-en.pdf)) and taking the voluntary guidelines on safeguards in biodiversity financing mechanisms into account when selecting, designing and implementing biodiversity financing mechanisms and when developing instrument specific safeguards ([CBD/SBI/2/20](https://www.cbd.int/doc/c/6b12/6da9/e96c8a0d0993cb60ac790653/sbi-02-20-en.pdf)), alongside [recommendation 10/4](https://www.cbd.int/doc/recommendations/wg8j-10/wg8j-10-rec-04-en.pdf) of the Working Group on Article 8(j) and Related Provisions, which was adopted following the discussion of these matters at the tenth meeting of the Working Group;
	4. An analysis and synthesis of information, as well as the draft framework of indicators, to review the effectiveness of the [Nagoya Protocol](https://www.cbd.int/abs/) (CBD/SBI/2/3), considered under agenda item 4;
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 85 others submitted their NBSAPs by 14 March 2018, making a total of 154[[5]](#footnote-5) (see annex II for the list of Parties).[[6]](#footnote-6) This represents almost 80 per cent of the Parties to the Convention.
6. The update and analysis of national biodiversity strategies and action plans (CBD/SBI/2/2/Add.1) summarizes progress in revising and implementing NBSAPs and national targets and analyses the contents of the post-Nagoya NSBAPs submitted by 14 March 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,[[7]](#footnote-7) 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 49 revised NBSAPs have been adopted as “whole-of-government” instruments and another 6 NBSAPs[[8]](#footnote-8) have been adopted as instruments applying to the environmental sector. While 15 other countries stated their intent to have their NBSAP adopted as a policy instrument, the majority (83 Parties, equivalent to 54 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 (23 Parties), communication and public awareness strategies (32 Parties), or capacity development strategies (18 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,[[9]](#footnote-9) 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/SBI/2/2/Add.1 and Add.2.
13. **National reports**
14. In adopting the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020,[[10]](#footnote-10) 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 14 March 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).[[11]](#footnote-11)
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/SBI/2/2/Add.2.
17. Three Aichi Biodiversity Targets have deadlines in the year 2015. As previously noted in decision XII/1, Aichi Biodiversity Target 10 (“By 2015, the multiple anthropogenic pressures on coral reefs, and other vulnerable ecosystems impacted by climate change or ocean acidification are minimized, so as to maintain their integrity and functioning”) has not been met though it remains valid. To accelerate progress, the Conference of the Parties, in decision [XII/23](https://www.cbd.int/doc/decisions/cop-12/cop-12-dec-23-en.pdf), adopted priority actions to achieve Aichi Biodiversity Target 10 for coral reefs and closely associated ecosystems.
18. Good progress is being made towards Aichi Biodiversity Target 16 (“By 2015, the Nagoya Protocol on Access to Genetic Resources and the Fair and Equitable Sharing of Benefits Arising from their Utilization is in force and operational, consistent with national legislation”). Since the adoption of the Nagoya Protocol and the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity in 2010, a number of initiatives have been taken by Parties to the Convention to achieve Target 16 and to make progress in the ratification and operationalization of the Protocol. The entry into force of the Protocol on 12 October 2014 marked the achievement of the first part of Target 16, and many Parties are currently working on revising existing access and benefit-sharing (ABS) measures or developing new ones to implement the Protocol. It is clear that Parties are still in the process of establishing institutional structures to implement the Protocol and publishing the necessary information in the [Access and Benefit-Sharing Clearing-House](https://absch.cbd.int/). While progress has been made, the operationalization of the Protocol, as required by the second part of Target 16, has not yet been fully achieved. Further information on this issue can be found in document CBD/SBI/2/INF/3.
19. According to the information contained in the interim national reports as well as the ABS Clearing‑House, 81 countries (65 Parties to the Nagoya Protocol and 16 non-Parties) have relevant ABS measures in place, 46 of which are currently in the process of revising existing or developing new ABS measures or planning to do so. Another 7 countries do not have ABS measures in place but are developing measures or planning to develop measures. A total of 63 countries have designated competent national authorities and 30 countries have established checkpoints.
20. With regard to Aichi Biodiversity Target 17 (By 2015, each Party has developed, adopted as a policy instrument, and has commenced implementing an effective, participatory and updated NBSAP), about 67 per cent of Parties have developed an NBSAP or revised one since the adoption of the Strategic Plan. Further, fewer than half of these have clearly adopted their NBSAPs as “whole-of-government” instruments. Given this, it is clear that Aichi Biodiversity Target 17, which has a deadline of 2015, has not been met. This assessment differs from that presented in the fourth edition of the *Global Biodiversity Outlook*, which concluded, based on the information available when it was prepared, that the first part of Aichi Biodiversity Target 17 (each Party has developed an NBSAP) was on track to be met. A progress report and updated methodology for the voluntary peer review of NBSAPs are presented in document [UNEP/CBD/COP/13/19](https://www.cbd.int/doc/meetings/cop/cop-13/official/cop-13-19-en.pdf).
21. **Progress in implementing the Gender Plan of Action**
22. In decision [XII/7](https://www.cbd.int/doc/decisions/cop-12/cop-12-dec-07-en.pdf), the Conference of Parties welcomed the 2015-2020 Gender Plan of Action under the Convention on Biological Diversity, requested the Executive Secretary to support its implementation and requested Parties to report on actions taken in this regard. The strategic objectives of the Plan are: (a) to mainstream a gender perspective in the implementation of the Convention and the associated work of the Parties and the Secretariat; (b) to promote gender equality in achieving the objectives of the Convention, the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020 and the Aichi Biodiversity Targets; (c) to demonstrate the benefits of gender mainstreaming in the achievement of the Convention’s objectives; and (d) to increase the effectiveness of all work under the Convention. This review of progress in the implementation of the 2015-2020 Gender Plan of Action is based on consideration of actions by Parties, stakeholders and the Secretariat in the light of these strategic objectives. Progress towards the achievement of these objectives and specific examples of actions taken are detailed in an addendum to the present document (CBD/SBI/2/2/Add.3).
23. Just under half of the post-Nagoya NBSAPs included some reference to gender or women’s issues, and a third of the plans identified gender perspectives as part of national targets or actions related to a national target. The majority of these actions focused on increasing women’s awareness of biodiversity conservation issues, and secondly on increasing women’s participation in biodiversity conservation. Lack of involvement of women as stakeholders was identified as a challenge for biodiversity conservation, or an indirect driver of biodiversity loss, in approximately one out of five NBSAPs (21 per cent). The need to strengthen scientific research and ensure the systematic collection of gender-disaggregated data has been recognized as an important factor to enable targeted responses. Additional needs identified through other inputs received from Parties and stakeholders were to increase staff skills and knowledge, and the availability of tools, guidelines and methodologies. Training needs include the integration of gender in the design and management of projects, and in the development and evaluation of policies.
24. Overall, even among countries that have recognized gender equality as a guiding principle, or have highlighted that the failure to involve women as stakeholders has been a challenge to biodiversity conservation, there is often limited information on strategies and actions to apply gender considerations in the NBSAPs, or on the engagement of women’s groups and/or ministries of women’s affairs in the NBSAP review and implementation process. Revised NBSAPs further showed no obvious pattern over time to suggest increased attention to gender issues following the tenth meeting of the Conference of the Parties through February 2018.
25. Actions to mainstream a gender perspective are being undertaken through a range of approaches, which also contribute to promoting gender equality in achieving the objectives of the Gender Plan of Action. Yet, much work is still needed to better integrate gender considerations, and to strengthen the case for how gender-responsive strategies and actions can support the attainment of biodiversity objectives. The development of the [post-2020 biodiversity framework](https://www.cbd.int/post2020/) provides an opportunity for increased attention to gender dimensions and their further integration in the context of the Convention. A review of the 2015-2020 Gender Plan of Action would help to determine areas that may need to be strengthened in a revised or updated Plan, and in the post-2020 framework.

# 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.
3. With respect to mainstreaming gender considerations in the work to implement the Convention, there remains a considerable gap in addressing issues of gender equality and women’s empowerment within NBSAPs. Attention to gender issues will need to be increased if the objectives of the 2015-2020 Gender Plan of Action are to be met. The development of the post-2020 biodiversity framework provides an opportunity for increased attention to gender dimensions and their further integration across all areas of work under Convention.

# Suggested recommendations

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

**A. Review of national biodiversity strategies and action plans and national reports**

*The Conference of the Parties*

1. *Takes note* ofthe updated analysis of national biodiversity strategies and action plans and national reports, and *requests* the Executive Secretary to update this information periodically and to make it available through the clearing-house mechanism of the Convention;

2. *Also takes note* ofthe progress in the adoption by Parties of their national biodiversity strategies and action plans as whole-of-government policy instruments, and *requests* the Executive Secretary, in collaboration with the Secretariat of the Global Environment Facility, the United Nations Development Programme and the United Nations Environment Programme, to analyse the status of adoption of national biodiversity strategies and action plans by eligible Parties;

**B. Gender Plan of Action**

*Recalling* decision XII/7, in which it welcomed the 2015-2020 Gender Plan of Action under the Convention,

*Noting* that the 2015-2020 Gender Plan of Action is now at a mid-way point, and *recognizing* the need for effective implementation of the Plan, including towards the achievement of the Aichi Biodiversity Targets and the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020,

1. *Emphasizes* the need to address gender considerations in the development of the post-2020 biodiversity framework and in line with gender targets of the Sustainable Development Goals;[[12]](#footnote-12)

2. *Requests* Parties and other relevant stakeholders to support actions to strengthen knowledge of gender and biodiversity linkages, including the provision of dedicated resources for ongoing capacity‑building on gender and biodiversity issues, and the collection of sex-disaggregated data;

3. *Also requests* Parties and other relevant stakeholders to support harmonized approaches and joint action on capacity‑building and implementation of gender-responsive measures under the three Rio Conventions;

4*. Requests* the Executive Secretary, subject to availability of resources, to undertake a review of the implementation of the 2015-2020 Gender Plan of Action, in parallel to the development of the fifth edition of the *Global Biodiversity Outlook*, in order to identify gaps, best practices and lessons learned.

*Annex I*

# List of national reports received by the Secretariat of the Convention on Biological Diversity by 14 March 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. Estonia
58. Ethiopia
59. European Union
60. Fiji
61. Finland
62. France
63. Gambia
64. Georgia
65. Germany
66. Ghana
67. Greece
68. Grenada
69. Guatemala
70. Guinea
71. Guinea-Bissau
72. Guyana
73. Haiti
74. Honduras
75. Hungary
76. India
77. Indonesia
78. Iran (Islamic Republic of)
79. Iraq
80. Ireland
81. Israel
82. Italy
83. Jamaica
84. Japan
85. Jordan
86. Kazakhstan
87. Kenya
88. Kiribati
89. Kuwait
90. Kyrgyzstan
91. Lao People’s Democratic Republic
92. Latvia
93. Lebanon
94. Liberia
95. Liechtenstein
96. Lithuania
97. Luxembourg
98. Madagascar
99. Malawi
100. Malaysia
101. Maldives
102. Mali
103. Malta
104. Marshall Islands
105. Mauritania
106. Mauritius
107. Mexico
108. Micronesia (Federated States of)
109. Monaco
110. Mongolia
111. Montenegro
112. Morocco
113. Mozambique
114. Myanmar
115. Namibia
116. Nauru
117. Nepal
118. Netherlands
119. New Zealand
120. Nicaragua
121. Niger
122. Nigeria
123. Niue
124. Norway
125. Oman
126. Pakistan
127. Palau
128. Panama
129. Papua New Guinea
130. Paraguay
131. Peru
132. Philippines
133. Poland
134. Portugal
135. Qatar
136. Republic of Korea
137. Republic of Moldova
138. Romania
139. Russian Federation
140. Rwanda
141. Saint Kitts and Nevis
142. Saint Lucia
143. Saint Vincent and the Grenadines
144. Samoa
145. San Marino
146. Sao Tome and Principe
147. Saudi Arabia
148. Senegal
149. Serbia
150. Seychelles
151. Sierra Leone
152. Singapore
153. Slovakia
154. Slovenia
155. Solomon Islands
156. Somalia
157. South Africa
158. South Sudan
159. Spain
160. Sri Lanka
161. State of Palestine
162. Sudan
163. Suriname
164. Swaziland
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 14 march 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. Estonia
51. Ethiopia
52. European Union
53. Finland
54. France
55. Gambia
56. Georgia
57. Germany
58. Ghana
59. Grenada
60. Greece
61. Guatemala
62. Guinea
63. Guinea-Bissau
64. Guyana
65. Honduras
66. Hungary
67. India
68. Indonesia
69. Iran (Islamic Republic of)
70. Iraq
71. Ireland
72. Italy
73. Jamaica
74. Japan
75. Jordan
76. Kiribati
77. Kyrgyzstan
78. Lao People’s Democratic Republic
79. Latvia
80. Lebanon
81. Liberia
82. Liechtenstein
83. Lithuania
84. Luxembourg
85. Madagascar
86. Malawi
87. Malaysia
88. Maldives
89. Mali
90. Malta
91. Mauritania
92. Mauritius
93. Mexico
94. Mongolia
95. Montenegro
96. Morocco
97. Mozambique
98. Myanmar
99. Namibia
100. Nauru
101. Nepal
102. Netherlands
103. New Zealand
104. Nicaragua
105. Niger
106. Nigeria
107. Niue
108. Norway
109. Paraguay
110. Peru
111. Philippines
112. Poland
113. Qatar
114. Republic of Korea
115. Republic of Moldova
116. Romania
117. Russian Federation
118. Rwanda
119. Saint Kitts and Nevis
120. Samoa
121. San Marino
122. Sao Tome and Principe
123. Senegal
124. Serbia
125. Seychelles
126. Slovakia
127. Solomon Islands
128. Somalia
129. South Africa
130. Spain
131. Sri Lanka
132. Sudan
133. Suriname
134. Swaziland
135. Sweden
136. Switzerland
137. Tajikistan
138. Thailand
139. Timor-Leste
140. Togo
141. Tonga
142. Tunisia
143. Tuvalu
144. Uganda
145. Ukraine
146. United Arab Emirates
147. United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland
148. United Republic of Tanzania
149. Uruguay
150. Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of)
151. Viet Nam
152. Yemen
153. Zambia
154. Zimbabwe

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

1. \* [CBD/SBI/2/1](https://www.cbd.int/doc/c/6ce5/878e/5ffa49887c20c19961fe040a/sbi-02-01-en.pdf). [↑](#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. NBSAPs from two additional Parties were received after that date. They are included in the list contained in annex II to the present document but are not included in the analysis (CBD/SBI/2/2/Add.1 and Add.2). [↑](#footnote-ref-5)
6. The subsequent analysis is based on the 153 NBSAPs that were submitted in one of the official languages of the United Nations. [↑](#footnote-ref-6)
7. [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-7)
8. Australia, Bhutan, Dominican Republic, Guatemala, Lithuania and Tajikistan. [↑](#footnote-ref-8)
9. 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-9)
10. Decision X/2. [↑](#footnote-ref-10)
11. See annex I for the list of Parties. [↑](#footnote-ref-11)
12. See [General Assembly resolution 70/1](http://www.un.org/en/ga/search/view_doc.asp?symbol=A/RES/70/1), annex. [↑](#footnote-ref-12)