



Convention on Biological Diversity

Distr.
GENERAL

CBD/SBI/2/4/Add.1
31 May 2018

ORIGINAL: ENGLISH

SUBSIDIARY BODY ON IMPLEMENTATION

Second meeting

Montreal, Canada, 9-13 July 2018

Item 5 of the provisional agenda*

INSTITUTIONAL MECHANISMS AND EFFECTIVE MEASURES TO ENHANCE IMPLEMENTATION AT THE NATIONAL LEVEL

Note by the Executive Secretary

INTRODUCTION

1. One of the key mandates of the Subsidiary Body on Implementation is “to identify strategic actions to enhance implementation”, which “may include, as appropriate, actions related to mainstreaming; the development and implementation of coherent and effective measures and supporting institutional frameworks”, as well as actions related to synergies with other biodiversity-related conventions, partnerships with other intergovernmental and non-governmental organizations; and the enhancement of the role of relevant actors...”¹

2. In decision [XIII/3](#), paragraph 18(e), the Conference of the Parties invited Parties and other Governments to “review the implementation of cross-sectoral mainstreaming measures undertaken at the national level, including national institutional mechanisms to support the implementation of the Convention and the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020, and to identify gaps, if any, and to strengthen such measures, as needed.” In paragraph 105 of the same decision, the Conference of the Parties requested the Executive Secretary, subject to the availability of resources, to identify best practices and successful models of institutional mechanisms in place at the national level, drawing on new information from Parties, information available in the fifth national reports, the clearing-house mechanism, and other existing sources of information, to support implementation of the Convention and the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020, and to report to the Subsidiary Body on Implementation at its second meeting. Further, in decision [XIII/25](#), the Conference of the Parties requested the Executive Secretary, subject to the availability of resources, to prepare, in consultation with Parties and relevant stakeholders, information on the obstacles identified pursuant to paragraph 3 of the decision, as well as to identify effective practices related to the implementation of national and global targets (para. 4).

3. The present document is provided in response to these requests. It draws on new information from Parties, information available in the fifth national reports, the clearing-house mechanism, and other existing sources of information. In addition, the Executive Secretary issued a notification² on 25 January 2018 inviting Parties and relevant stakeholders to, inter alia, submit case studies regarding obstacles and effective practices related to the implementation of the Convention and the Strategic Plan, and options for

* [CBD/SBI/2/1](#).

¹ Modus operandi of the Subsidiary Body on Implementation (decision XIII/25, annex).

² 2018-019.

improving implementation at the national level, including successful models of institutional mechanisms in place at the national level to support implementation of the Convention and Strategic Plan 2011-2020.³

4. A number of other agenda items to be taken up by the Subsidiary Body also have a bearing on these requests, and references to relevant documents are included herein. These include documents CBD/SBI/2/2/Add.1,⁴ CBD/SBI/2/11,⁵ and CBD/SBI/2/2.⁶ The present document also draws on the updated scientific assessment of progress towards selected biodiversity targets and options to accelerate progress ([CBD/SBSTTA/22/5](#)) prepared for the twenty-second meeting of the Subsidiary Body on Scientific, Technical and Technological Advice.

5. Section I below provides information on institutional mechanisms for the implementation of the Convention and the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020. Section II provides information on effective measures to enhance implementation at the national level. Section III provides conclusions with options for potential actions to improve implementation.

I. INSTITUTIONAL MECHANISMS

6. One of the most important elements of the implementation of the Convention and the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020 is the use of effective national-level institutional mechanisms. Such mechanisms are key to ensuring a government-wide approach to the development and implementation of national biodiversity strategies and action plans (NBSAPs), integrating the consideration of biodiversity in decisions and actions that may impact biodiversity, and engaging stakeholders in decision-making.

A. Types of institutional mechanisms

7. There are a variety of approaches to effective institutional mechanisms for implementing the Convention and the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020 at the national level, including regulatory requirements, formal interministerial committees and other arrangements, scientific councils and platforms, watch-dog institutions, and consultative processes for stakeholder engagement. Examples of various approaches are provided below, grouped into four general categories: (a) government coordination structures; (b) mechanisms for stakeholder inputs and engagement; (c) multi-stakeholder knowledge platforms; and (d) independent governmental audit or evaluation entities.

1. Government coordination structures

8. A common institutional mechanism is the use of government coordination mechanisms, such as interministerial committees or governmental working groups. The update on progress in revising/updating and implementing national biodiversity strategies and action plans (CBD/SBI/2/2/Add.1) found that, as of 14 March 2018, of the 153 NBSAPs received since the adoption of the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020, 87 reported having a formal coordination structure, with varying types of mandates. While in some countries their mandate is limited to the revision of the NBSAP, in others, coordination mechanisms are also mandated to monitor implementation (see CBD/SBI/2/2/Add.1, para. 26). In the case of 11 NBSAPs, these indicated that such committees were also mandated to oversee the implementation process itself.

9. A specific example of a government coordination structure is the National Committee for Biodiversity Conservation (NCBC) of China, established in 2011, which coordinates biodiversity conservation actions at the national level in addition to the existing mechanisms, such as the Inter-ministerial Joint Conference for Protection of Biological Resources and the National Coordinating Group for Implementation of the Convention on Biological Diversity. In China, most provincial governments have reinforced institutions related to biodiversity, such as departments of the environment, agriculture, forestry and marine management, and established interdepartmental coordinating mechanisms. Another

³ The compilation of submissions from Parties and other entities can be found at <https://www.cbd.int/mainstreaming/sbstta-sbi/preparation/default.shtml>.

⁴ Update on progress in revising/updating and implementing national biodiversity strategies and action plans, including national targets.

⁵ Mechanisms to facilitate review of implementation.

⁶ Progress in the implementation of the Convention and the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020.

example is the National Commission for the Knowledge and Use of Biodiversity (CONABIO) in Mexico, which is an intersectoral commission comprised of several ministries, including environment, agriculture, economy, tourism and foreign affairs. Madagascar also has, in the majority of public sector areas, institutionalized environmental departments whose main roles are to optimize positive environmental impacts and limit the negative impacts of sectoral plans, programmes and projects. Some of these are the Interministerial Committee on the Environment, the Steering Committee for Biodiversity Projects, the Interministerial Committee on Mines and Forests, the Upstream Oil and Forests Committee, the Land and Forestry Committee and the Environment and Fisheries Committee.

2. Mechanisms for stakeholder inputs and engagement

10. A second form of institutional mechanism consists of platforms or councils that can be either supported by the government or formed independently by stakeholders, whose purpose is to ensure that stakeholder interests are taken into account in governmental plans, programmes and policies that might affect them. These can be either temporary or long-term arrangements.

11. Many Parties included non-governmental entities in the revision process of their NBSAPs. These include indigenous and local communities (reported in 36 NBSAPs), non-governmental organizations (NGOs)/civil society (91 NBSAPs), private sector (47 NBSAPs) and academia (64 NBSAPs) (CBD/SBI/2/2/Add.1 para. 25). Specific examples of this approach include:

(a) Namibia created a NBSAP2 Committee, which is comprised of several governmental ministries, universities, indigenous and local communities, and donor agencies. The committee was originally established to oversee the formulation of NBSAP2 but its mandate has been extended so that it can also coordinate the implementation of the national action plan on biodiversity, including its monitoring and evaluation;

(b) In Denmark, the national Government has set up a special committee for the environment, with membership comprised of ministries, agencies and interest groups. The Committee meets four times a year to discuss and approve new laws and policies. Japan established a Committee for the United Nations Decade on Biodiversity, with broad stakeholder participation and collaboration, including representatives of the national Government, local governments, NGOs, business, academics and various production sectors;

(c) In Canada, environmental impact assessment procedures provide an opportunity for citizens to express and convey their concerns about specific projects, such as hydroelectric projects. Public hearings are held as part of the assessment, and these provide an opportunity for the project to be presented to the general public along with its environmental, social and economic impacts and the planned mitigation and environmental monitoring measures.

3. Multi-stakeholder knowledge platforms

12. A third type of institutional mechanism is one that brings together governmental and non-governmental experts to exchange scientific and technical information related to the implementation of the Convention. An example of this approach is the Alexander von Humboldt Biological Resources Research Institute in Colombia which is a non-profit civil corporation, linked to the Ministry of Environment and Sustainable Development and to the national environmental system. It is responsible for promoting, coordinating and conducting scientific research on the continental biodiversity of the country. The Institute's governing assembly and board are constituted by government entities, universities and NGOs.

13. In Madagascar, the implementation of national commitments for the establishment and management of protected areas, involving 123 protected areas covering an area of more than 7 million ha, was facilitated by the creation of the Commission on the System of Protected Areas of Madagascar (SAPM Commission), whose role is to guide and coordinate the interventions of the different stakeholders and to validate the tools to be used by the managers of the protected areas. This commission brings together governmental entities whose areas of responsibility may be directly or indirectly affected by the establishment of protected areas (ministries in charge of protected areas, mines, hydrocarbons, energy, tourism, agriculture, tourism, livestock, transport, fisheries and fishery resources, spatial planning, population, defence, water, public

works, health, trade, national office for the environment) and non-governmental entities that have interests, notably technical and financial partners (including conservation NGOs, research organizations).

14. Another example of a multi-stakeholder knowledge platform is the Community of Practice on Biodiversity and Health (COPBH) established by Belgium. COPBH is composed of members representing various fields and stakeholders, including science, policy, consultants, NGOs and the media. The goal of the community is to enhance biodiversity- and health-related science, policy and practice in Belgium. COPBH supports Belgian delegations in international processes related to health issues, and strongly focuses on mainstreaming biodiversity in the Belgian National Environment and Health Action Plan.

15. The Wildlife Institute of India is another example of an autonomous institution whose governing body is led by the Ministry of Environment, Forest and Climate Change, but is also comprised of non-governmental representatives, including eminent scientists, naturalists and/or conservation experts nominated by the President. The Institute contributes significantly to wildlife research and management.

4. *Independent governmental audit or evaluation entities*

16. A fourth type of institutional mechanism is the use of independent governmental audit or evaluation institutions. Such entities are used to evaluate compliance by governmental entities with their mandates and relevant regulations.

17. Some Parties have established a specialized entity to evaluate progress with respect to environmental matters. For example, the Office of the Auditor General of Canada includes a Commissioner of the Environment and Sustainable Development. The Commissioner provides parliamentarians with objective, independent analyses and recommendations on the federal Government's efforts to protect the environment and foster sustainable development. The Commissioner conducts performance audits and is responsible for monitoring the sustainable development strategies of federal departments, overseeing an environmental petitions process, and auditing the federal Government's management of environmental and sustainable development issues.⁷

B. Institutional mechanisms and the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development

18. Given the importance of biodiversity in the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development⁸ and the relevance of its implementation for the Convention, it is also important to take note of the development of institutional mechanisms by countries for the implementation of the 2030 Agenda. It would be important to ensure appropriate linkages between such efforts and those under the Convention.

19. An analysis prepared by the United Nations Department of Economic and Social Affairs of arrangements for implementing the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development contains valuable information from 64 countries that presented voluntary national reviews at the High-level Political Forum in 2016-2017.⁹ The document notes that "by reflecting the approaches taken by countries facing different contexts and circumstances, the compendium aims to facilitate exchanges on institutional practices and lessons learned among governments and other stakeholders, thereby helping them to support the realization of the [Sustainable Development Goals]."¹⁰

20. The compendium states that a substantial number of countries have created new interministerial committees to spur and coordinate the implementation of actions towards achieving the Sustainable Development Goals (for example Azerbaijan, Bangladesh, Belgium, Botswana, Chile, China, Colombia, Costa Rica, Denmark, El Salvador, Germany, Japan, Madagascar, Mexico, Nepal, the Philippines, Portugal and Slovenia). Several institutional arrangements in different countries reflect the above-mentioned categories, including multi-stakeholder mechanisms or arrangements led by government agencies.

21. For example, in Namibia, the Sustainable Development Advisory Council is a cross-sectoral body involving four governmental and four non-governmental representatives whose main function is to

⁷ http://www.oag-bvg.gc.ca/internet/English/au_fs_e_370.html#Commissioner

⁸ See General Assembly resolution [70/1](#) of 25 September 2015.

⁹ "Compendium of National Institutional Arrangements for implementing the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development", 2018.

¹⁰ [Ibid., p. 1 \(Introduction\)](#).

promote cooperation and coordination on environmental issues relating to sustainable development. In the Philippines, the implementation of the development plan is done through the Board of the National Economic and Development Authority (NEDA) and its committees. The NEDA Board is composed of the President as chairman, the Secretary of Socio-economic Planning and NEDA Director-General as vice-chairman, and the following as members: the Executive Secretary and the secretaries of finance, trade and industry, agriculture, environment and natural resources, public works and highways, budget and management, among others. Several other examples are presented in the compendium.

C. Conclusions

22. The use of effective institutional mechanisms is among the most important measures that Parties can take to enhance implementation of the Convention and the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020. While in decision XIII/3, paragraph 18(e), the Conference of the Parties invited Parties and other Governments to “review the implementation of cross-sectoral mainstreaming measures undertaken at the national level, including national institutional mechanisms to support the implementation of the Convention and the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020, and to identify gaps, if any, and to strengthen such measures, as needed,” there is little information on whether such reviews have been undertaken or are planned. A study by the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD) notes that “it would be timely for Governments to review the existing institutional structures in place, what they are intended to achieve and evaluate their impacts and end-results. If current institutional mechanisms are not performing the anticipated results, Governments should consider updating them to reflect evolving policies and national priorities. Furthermore, Governments should reflect on the challenges they face or the obstacles that might be hindering the desired results of national mechanisms.”¹¹ Such reviews would be especially important in the light of the development of national-level mechanisms to implement the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development, and the pending development of a new global framework on biodiversity that will be adopted in 2020.

II. EFFECTIVE MEASURES TO ENHANCE IMPLEMENTATION AT THE NATIONAL LEVEL

23. As noted in the introduction, one of the key mandates of the Subsidiary Body on Implementation is “to identify strategic actions to enhance implementation”, which may include, as appropriate, “the development and implementation of coherent and effective measures and supporting institutional frameworks” (decision XIII/25, annex). This section focuses on effective measures to enhance implementation of the Convention and the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020. Other strategic actions to enhance implementation are addressed under other agenda items, including agenda item 11 (on cooperation), agenda item 12 (mechanisms for review of implementation), and agenda item 13 (national reporting).

24. In order to identify measures to enhance implementation at the national level, it is essential to first consider the effectiveness of existing practices. A number of analyses undertaken by the Secretariat are relevant to understanding the effectiveness of practices undertaken at the national level for implementation of the Convention and the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020 on a global scale. First, work undertaken in preparation for the twenty-second meeting of the Subsidiary Body on Scientific, Technical and Technological Advice on progress towards selected Aichi Biodiversity Targets, on the basis of recent scientific literature, indicators, and regional and thematic assessments of biodiversity and ecosystem services of the Intergovernmental Science-Policy Platform for Biodiversity and Ecosystem Services provides further evidence of the continuing decline of biodiversity globally, reinforcing the need for urgent and effective actions to reduce the rate of biodiversity loss (see CBD/SBSTTA/22/5, para. 25). In particular, the note concluded, “the need to address the underlying causes of biodiversity loss, the need for the greater mainstreaming of biodiversity and the need to consider the direct and indirect impacts of policy decisions have been identified as important challenges to address”.

¹¹ Karousakis, K (forthcoming, 2018), “Evaluating the effectiveness of biodiversity policies: impact evaluation, cost-effectiveness analysis, and other approaches”, OECD Environment Working Paper.

25. The analysis by the Secretariat of the contribution of targets established by Parties and progress towards the Aichi Biodiversity Targets (CBD/SBI/2/2/Add.2) is also relevant. Among the conclusions, the Secretariat found 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, these commitments and efforts will need to be significantly scaled up if the Aichi Biodiversity Targets and the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020, more generally, are to be met.”¹² The Secretariat found both that many NBSAPs do not contain national targets or commitments that reflect the Aichi Biodiversity Targets, and that the number of NBSAPs with targets having a scope and level of ambition similar to the Aichi Targets rarely surpassed 20 per cent.¹³

26. There is an overall lack of data on the effectiveness of specific measures taken at the national level to implement the Convention and the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020. An important gap in assessing the effectiveness of practices is the relatively few empirical studies that have been undertaken to analyse the actual impacts on biodiversity from the use of various measures, compared to similar studies undertaken in other fields, such as development and health.¹⁴

27. The guidelines for the sixth national reports, adopted in decision XIII/27, include, as one of seven sections of the reports, “implementation measures taken, assessment of their effectiveness, associated obstacles and scientific and technical needs to achieve national targets.” In addition, the Conference of the Parties, in decision XIII/1, paragraph 29, encouraged Parties to undertake evaluations of the effectiveness of measures undertaken to implement the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020, to document experiences, including the methodologies applied, to identify lessons learned, and to provide this information to the Executive Secretary, including through their sixth national report and the clearing-house mechanism. These reports will therefore provide one important source of information that will facilitate the identification of measures to enhance strategic actions for implementation at the national level, and inform discussions on the post-2020 global framework for biodiversity.

28. The need for better information regarding practices at the national level was taken up during the twenty-first meeting of SBSTTA. Information to assist Parties in undertaking such evaluations was included in the note by the Executive Secretary,¹⁵ and SBSTTA recommended that the Conference of the Parties adopt a decision at its fourteenth meeting encouraging the use of such information when designing and undertaking evaluations of the effectiveness of measures taken to implement the Convention.¹⁶

29. The Secretariat has undertaken work to identify possible actions that could be taken by Parties to further implementation. For example, the fourth edition of the *Global Biodiversity Outlook* identifies a set of actions which could be taken to accelerate progress towards each Aichi Biodiversity Target. Further, the Conference of the Parties, in decision [XII/1](#) took note of a collation of views of Parties with regard to the scientific and technical needs relating to cross-cutting issues and to specific Aichi Biodiversity Targets of the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020, based on SBSTTA recommendation XVII/1. In addition a list of additional possible actions that could be taken by Parties is included in the above-referenced document for the twenty-second meeting of SBSTTA (CBD/SBSTTA/22/5).

30. Numerous other decisions adopted by the Conference of the Parties also include many specific areas for additional possible action, for example decision XIII/3 on mainstreaming of biodiversity. However, the extent to which such actions have been implemented has not been extensively evaluated to identify both successes and gaps.

31. Documents CBD/SBI/2/2 and Add.1 find that few of the revised NBSAPs contain resource mobilization strategies, communication and public awareness strategies, or capacity-building strategies as the NBSAP guidance suggests. Only a few NBSAPS demonstrate that biodiversity is being mainstreamed

¹² CBD/SBI/2/2/Add.2, para. 59.

¹³ CBD/SBI/2/2/Add.2, para. 56.

¹⁴ Karousakis, K (forthcoming, 2018), “Evaluating the effectiveness of biodiversity policies: impact evaluation, cost-effectiveness analysis, and other approaches”, OECD Environment Working Paper.

¹⁵ [CBD/SBSTTA/21/7](#).

¹⁶ SBSTTA recommendation XXI/6, para. 3.

significantly into cross sectoral plans and policies, poverty eradication policies, or even into sustainable development plans. There is also little evidence of the use of valuation studies to encourage mainstreaming.

32. In order to enhance implementation at the national level, an understanding of the challenges and obstacles to implementation, in addition to effective practices, is needed. Thus, as indicated in paragraph 2 above, the Conference of the Parties in decision [XIII/25](#), paragraph 4, requested the Executive Secretary, subject to the availability of resources, to prepare, in consultation with Parties and relevant stakeholders, information on obstacles and to identify effective practices related to the implementation of national and global targets.

33. The Executive Secretary, as part of notification 2018-019, invited Parties and other relevant stakeholders, *inter alia*, to submit case studies regarding obstacles and effective practices related to implementation, and options for improving implementation of the Convention and Strategic Plan 2011-2020 at the national level. However, of the submissions received by the Secretariat in response to this notification, none included case studies on these issues.

34. The note by the Executive Secretary on mechanisms to facilitate review of implementation (CBD/SBI/2/11) also discusses the issue of obstacles.

35. Improving financial information related to biodiversity is critical for implementing the Aichi targets at the national level. In line with the targets for resource mobilization adopted by the Conference of the Parties at its thirteenth meeting¹⁷ and the methodology developed by the Biodiversity Finance (BIOFIN) Initiative of the United Nations Development Programme, it is necessary to analyse the political and institutional context of biodiversity finance, to measure current biodiversity expenditures, and to assess future financial needs for the effective implementation of NBSAPs as critical steps for calculating the finance gap and for developing a national finance strategy which would identify the most appropriate financing solutions to close or reduce this finance gap and to achieve the goals of the national biodiversity strategy and action plans and associated national targets.

36. This approach also provides the opportunity to take stock of biodiversity finance provided by relevant stakeholders beyond the public sector, such as the private sector, academia and research organizations.

37. With respect to obstacles and challenges in implementing specific Aichi Biodiversity Targets, the analysis carried out by the Secretariat found numerous articles that identify various obstacles or challenges that need to be overcome in order to facilitate actions being taken. Some examples include the cost of certification as a barrier to the adoption of organic agriculture or certifying forestry and fishers as sustainable. Another obstacle identified was financial barriers to the adoption of more efficient technologies or approaches, such as agriculture (see CBD/SBSTTA/22/5, para. 36).

38. Cutting across obstacles to implementation is the fact that the value of biodiversity in general continues to be largely invisible to public and private decision makers. For example, biodiversity is currently not perceived by most businesses as directly impacting them. There is a need to improve the understanding of how biodiversity underpins the provision of ecosystem services and benefits that are critical for business operations and business models, and to take this understanding to the forefront of business discussions.

39. There is also a lack of robust indicators for important aspects of the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020, in particular some of the key mainstreaming targets such as Aichi Biodiversity Target 2, on integration of biodiversity into national and local development and poverty reduction strategies, planning processes, and national accounts. The Convention on Biological Diversity could also use the development of the post-2020 biodiversity strategy as a means to identify such targets and metrics for both the public and private sectors.

40. One effort to address this is the work of the Natural Capital Coalition in developing the Natural Capital Protocol, a framework designed to help generate credible and actionable information for business

¹⁷ Decision XIII/20.

managers, by providing a standardized approach to identify, measure and value business impacts and dependencies on natural capital and ecosystem services, to inform and improve internal management decision-making. It does not currently provide specific guidance on biodiversity. However, there are several projects under way which are aimed, among other things, at further strengthening the role of biodiversity in the natural capital concept, with a “biodiversity supplement” to the Natural Capital Protocol as one possible concrete output of this work. A working group has currently been established with a view to undertaking work on the role of biodiversity in the natural capital concept.¹⁸

41. Effective communication of the value of biodiversity is also a key element for overcoming obstacles to implementation. This can take form at different levels, from policy messages about the importance of biodiversity to poverty eradication and development, livelihoods, and health, to more technical data demonstrating the value of biodiversity. Effective communication needs to be targeted to specific audiences, sectors and actors.

42. At its thirteenth meeting, the Conference of the Parties welcomed the framework for a communications strategy, which identifies actions to be taken by Parties, stakeholders and the Secretariat (decision XIII/22). Work to advance such actions remains a critical aspect for overcoming obstacles to implementation. In addition, in its decision on mainstreaming, the Conference of the Parties requested that the Executive Secretary “develop, as appropriate, messaging approaches on biodiversity mainstreaming for specific target groups related to these sectors, including agriculture, forestry, fisheries and aquaculture, and tourism, as part of the delivery on the global communication strategy and messaging approaches as set out in decision XII/2” (decision XIII/3, para. 109). Further work in this area is needed to implement these decisions.

III. CONCLUSIONS

43. The Conference of the Parties at its fifteenth meeting is expected to adopt a global biodiversity framework in 2020. This would be done in the context of the 2050 Vision of the current Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020 as well the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development and other relevant international processes, and in the light of an assessment of progress in achieving the goals and Aichi Biodiversity Targets of the current plan as well as of future scenarios of change. In this regard, identifying obstacles that Parties have faced, and consequently their potential solutions, as well as effective measures for the implementation of the Convention and its Strategic Plan, is of fundamental importance.

44. The Conference of the Parties may wish to call for all Parties to undertake further reviews of the effectiveness of actions taken at the national level, identify both obstacles to implementation and gaps in the use of effective measures to support implementation, and include the results of such reviews in their sixth national reports. This includes: (a) actions related to mainstreaming, the development and implementation of coherent and effective measures and supporting institutional frameworks; (b) synergies with other biodiversity-related conventions, and partnerships with other intergovernmental and NGOs; and (c) the enhancement of the role of relevant actors.

45. The Conference of the Parties may also wish to request that additional work be undertaken by the Executive Secretary, in collaboration with other relevant entities, to evaluate the impacts of biodiversity policies in order to better understand what approaches are more effective than others, and to support Parties in their reviews.

¹⁸ <https://naturalcapitalcoalition.org/projects/biodiversity/>