



Convention on Biological Diversity

Distr.
GENERAL

CBD/SBI/3/INF/11
14 January 2021

ENGLISH ONLY

SUBSIDIARY BODY ON IMPLEMENTATION

Third meeting

Venue and dates to be determined

Item 9 of the provisional agenda*

UPDATED ANALYSIS OF EXPERIENCE UNDER THE CONVENTION AND OTHER PROCESSES, AND CONSIDERATIONS FOR THE ENHANCEMENT OF A MULTIDIMENSIONAL REVIEW MECHANISM

Note by the Executive Secretary

I. INTRODUCTION

1. In [decision 14/29](#) (para. 4 (a)), the Conference of the Parties requested the Executive Secretary to further develop, building on the elements of the multidimensional review approach described in the notes by the Executive Secretary on this matter,¹ for consideration of the Subsidiary Body on Implementation at its third meeting, options to enhance review mechanisms, with a view to strengthening the implementation of the Convention, including an analysis of strengths and weaknesses and an indication of possible costs, benefits and burdens for Parties, other stakeholders and the Secretariat, also taking into account best practices and lessons learned in other processes and comments received at the second meeting of the Subsidiary Body on Implementation.
2. This document provides background information and analysis to support deliberations under agenda item 9 on developing an enhanced planning, reporting and review mechanism under the Convention.
3. Section II provides an updated analysis of experiences with existing review tools under the Convention and other processes. Section III provides considerations for each of the review elements that are included in the proposal presented in CBD/SBI/3/11.

II. UPDATED ANALYSIS OF EXPERIENCES WITH EXISTING REVIEW MECHANISMS OR PROCESSES

A. Experiences under the Convention on Biological Diversity and its Protocols

4. The Convention on Biological Diversity has a multidimensional review approach, acknowledged in decision [14/29](#). This approach consists of a package of elements that complement one another. The multidimensional nature of this review approach is one of its strengths. However, the elements are only loosely integrated, and do not support one another seamlessly.
5. In developing an approach for strengthening the implementation of the Convention, it is important to consider the existing elements for multidimensional review and any opportunities there may be to strengthen the overall process in order to support Parties and stakeholders to be as ambitious as possible, to

* CBD/SBI/3/1.

¹ As described in UNEP/CBD/SBI/1/10/Add.3 and CBD/SBI/2/11.

share their experiences, to be accountable, and more generally to strive for maximum, efficient, and effective implementation of the Convention.

6. The existing multidimensional review mechanism includes:

(a) **Reviews of implementation by the Conference of the Parties:** Article 23 of the Convention states that the Conference of the Parties (COP) shall keep under review the implementation of the Convention. Reviews have been conducted at each meeting of the Conference of the Parties since the adoption of the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020. These reviews have been preceded and supported by the work of the Subsidiary Body on Implementation. The midterm and final reviews of the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020 have also been supported by the *Global Biodiversity Outlook*, and by the reports published by the Intergovernmental Science-Policy Platform on Biodiversity and Ecosystem Services (IPBES). Among the strengths of the reviews undertaken by the Conference of the Parties are that they provide Parties with a global overview of progress taking national submissions into account, and its regular and periodic nature. Further as the review is undertaken by the Convention's decision-making body, its outcomes have certain political weight and visibility;

(b) **National reports:** Article 26 of the Convention requires all Parties to prepare reports on the measures they have taken to implement the Convention and the effectiveness of these, at intervals determined by the Conference of the Parties. National reports bring together official data and information, and (oftentimes) inputs from relevant stakeholders. The format of the national reports is agreed by the Conference of the Parties with the aim of making available information which can be globally aggregated. The formats have historically been very flexible however, allowing national reports to be tailored to national circumstances. This flexibility and the different approaches taken nationally makes it difficult to aggregate information. There has also been a lack of the use of standardized data and indicators in reports. The rate of submission of the national reports, while improving, has also historically been a challenge with most national reports being submitted several months after the deadline established by the Conference of the Parties;²

(c) **National biodiversity strategies and action plans (NBSAPs)** are the main national planning instrument under the Convention. The NBSAP process often brings together different national stakeholders, raising their awareness, gaining their commitment to engage, and developing a national roadmap for implementation of the Convention. However, many NBSAPs lack basic information necessary to facilitate implementation, funding is often pending, and the variety of contents from one Party to another makes analysing and aggregating commitments and actions difficult. NBSAPs have, only in some countries, been used as whole-of-government policy instruments, limiting the mainstreaming of goals, targets and actions at the national level across key sectors impacting biodiversity. Furthermore, there is no requirement under the Convention for a periodic review and update of this instrument, and therefore no mechanism for communicating increased national ambition after a global review of implementation and while there is guidance on the development of NBSAPs, there is no standard format for them;

(d) **Voluntary Peer Review:** Adopted by decision 14/29 this is currently the only country-by-country review under the Convention. The in-depth reviews conducted during the VPR process provide opportunities for peer-to-peer learning, capacity development and dialogue with stakeholders. The VPR process could be strengthened by encouraging more Parties to volunteer to be reviewed and/or to nominate experts to serve on review teams and by building-in links to the broader Convention review process;

(e) **Decision Tracking Tool:** This tool provides a way to search for existing COP decisions and the extent to which they have been implemented. The tool currently includes an analysis and evaluation of all COP decisions up to the thirteenth meeting of the Conference of the Parties; however, it has not yet been used to support COP decision-making and there is not yet an adequate mechanism for its use;

² For further information see CBD/SBI/3/11/Add.1

7. The Cartagena and Nagoya Protocols have their own review mechanisms including the national reports to the Protocols, the respective compliance committees, and the assessment and review of the Cartagena Protocol and the review of effectiveness of the Nagoya Protocol. Both Protocols have compliance committees which play a facilitative role and conduct formal assessment and review processes. These committees provide mechanisms for taking stock of progress in implementation, effectiveness and gaps, including a review of procedures, mechanisms and strategies adopted by COP-MOPs.

8. Further details on these elements of the multidimensional review approach under the Convention and the Protocols are elaborated in sections I, III and annex I to document [UNEP/CBD/SBI/1/10/Add.3](#), and in section III of document [UNEP/CBD/SBI/2/11](#). Document CBD/SBI/3/11 presents a table with the strengths and weaknesses of each of these elements and key elements under other processes in its annexes.

B. Experience under other relevant intergovernmental processes

9. As can be seen in annex III of the chapeau document CBD/SBI/3/11, a wide array of mechanisms exists in other fora. While not all the features of these mechanisms are necessarily fit for use under the Convention on Biological Diversity, they may provide insight and inform discussions for the development or enhancement of a planning, reporting, monitoring and review mechanism under the Convention and the post 2020 global biodiversity framework. Some of these include:

(a) Periodic national commitments³ submitted by Parties, a global summing up of these, and a requirement for subsequent commitments to be more ambitious in order to increase global the level of ambition (“ratchet mechanism”);

(b) Periodic country-by-country review that feeds into a global aggregated review;

(c) Expert and/or peer review of national reports;

(d) A set of nationally-relevant core headline indicators to be used by all Parties, by which to track progress in implementation globally and consistently between Parties;

(e) An opportunity for structured dialogue between a Party and (a/the) review body on its national review or report;

(f) Opportunity for dialogue and exchange among Parties, and with experts and/or with a range of stakeholders on implementation progress;

(g) High level/political segment of review;

(h) Links from review to capacity-building, technical and scientific cooperation, implementation support and resource mobilization;

(i) Participation of non-state actors and stakeholders and rights-holders in the review of implementation, including by submitting, and reporting on voluntary commitments using agreed indicators for tracking progress at national and global levels;

(j) Participation of relevant United Nations agencies in the review process.

III. BACKGROUND ON PLANNING, REPORTING AND REVIEW MECHANISMS

10. Document CBD/SBI/3/11 presents a list of general considerations for the development of an enhanced planning, reporting and review mechanism under the Convention. This section complements that list by outlining providing additional information and background related to national planning, reporting, and review of implementation.

³ Document CBD/SBI/3/INF/19 explains how national commitments are used under other processes.

A. National biodiversity planning and targets

11. NBSAPs are the main vehicle for national implementation of the Convention. As is explained in document CBD/SBI/3/2/Add.1, these instruments vary significantly from one Party to another – mainly because they reflect national circumstances. Decision X/2 and Aichi Target 17 requested Parties to update their NBSAPs in participatory fashion, to align them with the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020 by 2015, and to adopt them as whole of government policy instruments. As Parties were also requested to set national targets in line with the Aichi Biodiversity Targets, most revised NBSAPs contain a set of national targets or similar commitments.

12. National targets or commitments are closely related to national planning. While neither are formally an instrument under the Convention, they are an expression of what governments intend to do and/or to achieve. Decision X/2 urged Parties to develop national and regional targets, using the Strategic Plan and its Aichi Targets, as a flexible framework. In decision 14/34, paragraph 11, the Conference of the Parties invited Parties and other Governments to consider developing, on a voluntary basis, biodiversity commitments that contribute to the achievement of the Convention, strengthen NBSAPs, facilitate the achievement of the Aichi Biodiversity Targets and contribute to an effective post-2020 global biodiversity framework, and to share information on these commitments through the Clearing-House Mechanism and other means.

13. There are several key aspects of national biodiversity planning and commitments:

(a) *The need and political feasibility for NBSAP revisions.* The duration (validity periods) of the existing revised NBSAPs varies significantly. While 81 NBSAPs “expire” in 2020, at the time of writing 7 have already expired (some are currently being updated), and 64 cover periods up to 2030. While revision is timely for Parties whose NBSAPs have expired (or are about to expire), for those whose NBSAPs are very recent, or still valid, an immediate revision may be less urgent (regardless of the contents of the new framework). For these Parties, an immediate revision of their NBSAP may even be politically sensitive with national stakeholders and decision makers, and inefficient from an implementation standpoint;

(b) *Periodicity of revisions.* Article 6 of the Convention requires Parties to submit a national biodiversity strategy and action plan or equivalent instrument but does not establish the intervals at which these should be updated. Aichi Biodiversity Target 17 set 2015 as the deadline for revisions in line with the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity. This target was only met by 69 Parties. In the post 2020 period, a common periodicity, and a regular schedule for updating national planning instruments and/or commitments would allow the Conference of the Parties to determine the collective ambition towards the goals and targets of the new framework, and the possible need to adjust (increase) ambition levels along the way;

(c) *Timely funding for NBSAP revisions.* The time intervals at which developing country Parties could be requested to submit their national planning and/or commitment documents in line with the post-2020 global biodiversity framework has to do with the possibility of ensuring timely support to undertake revisions to existing documents. This may impact how Parties ensure that there are mechanisms to support developing country Parties to develop, revise or update their NBSAPs by an established deadline;

(d) *Form and contents of revised NBSAPs.* Article 6 of the Convention provides for substantial flexibility on the form of NBSAPs. However, detailed guidance on their contents is provided in decision IX/8 and other decisions. The forms, contents and processes of Parties’ NBSAPs vary significantly⁴ as do their national targets.⁵ While this allows a maximum reflection of national realities, it also makes NBSAPs and their contents difficult to aggregate, analyse and compare so as to enhance transparency and inform global stocktaking;

(e) *National Targets.* Many Parties developed national targets using the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020 and its Aichi Biodiversity Targets as a flexible framework, and to report progress to the Conference of the Parties at its eleventh meeting. Few Parties met this deadline, which in turn made it

⁴ See CBD/SBI/3/2/Add.1.

⁵ See CBD/SBI/3/2/Add.2.

difficult for the Conference of the Parties to assess, in timely fashion, the level of ambition in the national response to the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020. Most national targets were submitted with the revised NBSAPs, most of which were also not submitted within the deadline set by COP 10. By March 2020 however, the Secretariat had received 4,107 separate “targets”, in varied forms and varied degrees of relatedness to the Aichi Biodiversity Targets. Again, this made it very difficult for the Conference of the Parties to assess how adequate the collective national response to the Strategic Plan was. With regard to national targets, Parties may wish to consider how national targets can be more clearly related to the global targets than in the past, how they can be submitted quickly and in a standard form that would facilitate timely global assessment of ambition;

(f) *Non-state actor commitments.* Following decision 14/34, paragraph 11, many actors have submitted voluntary commitments through the Sharm El-Sheik to Kunming Action Agenda.⁶ Some national governments have also made commitments through this platform. Many countries have also made official biodiversity-related commitments and pledges under other processes, including the other Rio conventions (UNFCCC and UNCCD) and the biodiversity related multilateral environmental agreements (such as CMS, CITES, RAMSAR and others). Many have also made biodiversity related commitments under voluntary processes such as the High Ambition Coalition for Nature and People,⁷ the Leaders’ Pledge for Nature launched during the United Nations Biodiversity Summit held in September 2020,⁸ the United Nations Decade on Ecosystem Restoration, among others. Parties may wish to consider how these voluntary national commitments relate to national targets (if at all) and how they may be harnessed to assess collective ambition toward the post-2020 global biodiversity framework. They may also wish to consider how subnational and non-state actor commitments could be addressed in the enhanced review mechanism;

(g) *NBSAPs as effective planning and implementation instruments.* While the revised NBSAPs show many signs of improvements from their predecessors in their quality as national planning instruments, there is still much room for improvement in this area. Many NBSAPs to date lack references to when and where actions will be taken (spatial and temporal data), many do not indicate costs and sources of resources for implementation, nor who is responsible for the different actions indicated and if that entity has accepted this responsibility (mainstreaming). Many do not indicate any links with the Sustainable Development Goals and with other national and global agendas to which biodiversity has much to contribute. Likewise, often opportunities to streamline national planning for biodiversity and other environmental areas (those under UNCCD, UNFCCC, Regional Seas, other MEAs) are not seized. Many NBSAPs also generally do not indicate how, when, and by whom implementation will be monitored at the national level (including assessments of effectiveness of measures taken), if at all, and how the results of this monitoring will feed back into national planning cycles.

B. National reports

14. Throughout the consultation process, Parties have emphasized that national reports should remain the main review tool under the Convention and should continue to be at the centre of an enhanced planning, reporting and review mechanism. It was also emphasized that national planning and reporting processes should be aligned and mutually supportive, and that the contents of these reports should be limited to what will be used for global reviewing or stocktaking and/or for national processes.

⁶ The Sharm El-Sheikh to Kunming Action Agenda for Nature and People (Action Agenda) was launched in November 2018 and serves as an online engagement platform to showcase, inspire and mobilize commitments and pledges on biodiversity from non-state actors and other stakeholders, in the lead up to COP 15 and beyond (inf doc for more information). Subnational and local authorities, and businesses, among others, have already created platforms such as the CitiesWithNature (<https://citieswithnature.org/>) and the BusinessforNature (<https://www.businessfornature.org/>) websites to showcase their commitments.

⁷ <https://www.campaignfornature.org/high-ambition-coalition>.

⁸ <https://www.leaderspledgefornature.org/>

15. While the format (including the online reporting tool), synchronization and synergy of national reports with the Protocols and with related MEAs is crucial, these issues are addressed in document CBD/SBI/3/11/Add.1 and will not be addressed here.

16. There are several key aspects regarding national reports:

(a) *Contents of national reports.* The sixth national report guidelines, adopted by decision XIII/27, requests Parties to report on (*inter alia*): (i) National targets established in the framework of the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020 and their links with the Aichi Biodiversity Targets; (ii) Measures taken to implement NBSAPs and the effectiveness of these measures; (iii) Progress towards national targets; and, (iv) National contribution to the achievement of the Aichi Biodiversity Targets. Parties responded to each of these in accordance with the contents of their NBSAPs, the existence (or not) of national targets, the links (if any) of national targets with the Aichi Biodiversity Targets, and the monitoring (if any) of NBSAP actions undertaken and of their effectiveness. As these features varied substantially from one Party to another, the contents of the sixth national reports have been very inconsistent from one Party to another making it difficult to assess overall progress and identify target areas that are falling short in progress.

Documents CBD/SBI/3/2/Add.1 and CBD/SBI/3/11/Add.1 highlight the challenges encountered both by Parties, in preparing- and by the Secretariat, in analysing the six national reports. The variation among national reports makes analysis of their information difficult and time consuming, and significantly limits the type and scope of analysis which can be undertaken. Both of these have important implications for the use of the information from national reports in the global review of implementation. These issues are caused, as discussed above, and exacerbated by the widely varying nature of national targets and translation of global targets to national levels, the variety/breadth of information requested in the reporting guidelines, and by shortcomings in the reporting template and online reporting tool;

(b) *The use of indicators.* While there seems to be a convergence in the post-2020 consultations on the desirability of having a core set of headline indicators that all Parties would report against, analysis of indicator use in the fifth and sixth national reports shows that Parties have used national data and national indicators considerably more than global data and indicators (CBD/SBSTTA/24/3). This is despite the Conference of the Parties' encouragement to Parties to use a small subset of indicators from the global indicator list contained in decision [XIII/28](#) that were identified as being available, easy to communicate, and for which national data are available. This has contributed to the difficulties in aggregating information from the national reports and consequently in tracking progress at the global level based on information in the national reports;

(c) *Quality of national reports.* While the sixth national reports show many signs of improvements from their predecessors in their quality, there is still much room for improvement. For instance, national reports often repeat information in the NBSAP (for example descriptions of the country's biodiversity), do not make use of much relevant data and information already existing in the country, and do little by way of assessing the effectiveness of measures taken to implement the Convention;

(d) *Periodicity of national reports.* With regard to timing and periodicity of national reports, although national reports have generally been submitted at four or five-year intervals, this is not fixed and could be modified by a request from the Conference of the Parties. The timing and periodicity will need to be considered alongside the timing and periodicity of national planning instruments and of the global monitoring and review (stocktake) that would take place under the post-2020 framework. As indicated in document CBD/SBI/3/11/Add.1, while the rate of submission of the latest report has shown improvements over previous rounds of reporting, only 23% of sixth national reports had been submitted by the reporting deadline (31 December 2018) established by the Conference of the Parties, and only 49% had been received six months later. This reality, as that mentioned above regarding the rate of submissions of the NBSAPs, poses an important challenge to global monitoring and review of progress.

The periodicity of national reports also needs to be considered in light of synchronization of national reporting between the Convention and the Protocols, and the implications of the periodicity of national

reports for review processes under the Protocols (for example the Compliance Committee and assessment and review under the Cartagena Protocol);

(e) *Timely funding for preparation of national reports.* As indicated above for NBSAPs, the time intervals at which Parties have been requested to submit their national reports have not always been met with timely support for developing countries to prepare these documents;

(f) *Reporting burden.* The preparation of national reports is often a burden for Parties, and sometimes consumes time and resources which could be dedicated to implementation efforts.

B. Review of implementation

17. Review of implementation can be conducted in different ways and can cover different subjects and scopes. A review could be conducted of the implementation efforts and progress of individual countries (as is done in the Voluntary Peer Review process and in the trial phase of the Open-ended Forum under the Subsidiary Body on Implementation) and in the experience of the Convention to date has been conducted by other Parties. This type of review can be called “country-by-country” review and will be addressed in subsection 1 below.

18. Review of implementation can also be conducted of the aggregate progress of all Parties towards global goals (or of aggregate commitments and actions) as the Conference of the Parties has done in the past.⁹ This “global review” will be addressed in subsection 2 below.

1. Country-by-country review

19. Country-by-country review is aimed at having a detailed look at the implementation progress and obstacles encountered by a country. Such a review can be general, or specific to a set of targets, actions, or ecosystems. While it could serve for transparency on how the country is addressing implementation issues, the information derived from these exercises is not intended to feed into tracking/reporting progress either at a national nor the global level. Country-by-country review rather has important facilitative, capacity development, and peer-learning functions and these can be considered its primary strengths and objectives.

20. The Conference of the Parties has already adopted the Voluntary Peer Review (VPR) process¹⁰ as part of the multidimensional review approach under the Convention. It is a peer-to-peer process whereby a team of Party-nominated experts undertake an in-depth review of implementation, including a desk study, country visit and interviews with key stakeholders. To date, 3 countries have been reviewed under the pilot phase of the VPR (Montenegro, Sri Lanka and Uganda). The results of the Montenegro VPR exercise were presented to the Conference of the Parties at its fourteenth meeting through an information document, and it is expected that Sri Lanka and Uganda VPRs will be presented at the fifteenth meeting of the Conference of the Parties. Likewise, there have been side events on the VPR process and experience at the thirteenth and fourteenth meetings of the Conference of the Parties.

21. The Special Virtual Session of the Subsidiary Body on Implementation and of the Subsidiary Body on Scientific, technical and Technological Advice held during the week of 15 to 18 September 2020 included a trial phase of another form of county-by-country review: an Open-ended Forum on implementation. The trial phase of the forum consisted of a plenary session of the Subsidiary Body on Implementation in which Parties volunteering to be reviewed presented their implementation successes and challenges and engaged in a dialogue with other Parties about them.

22. In deliberating on what type of country-by-country review should be part of the enhanced review mechanism under the Convention and post-2020 framework, Parties may wish to also consider the following:

⁹ Document CBD/SBI/2/11 (section II) outlined various dimensions of review mechanisms including: aggregate versus country-by-country review, status and trends versus commitments and actions, review of types of measures versus specific measures, and compliance based versus sharing of experiences.

¹⁰ Methodology of the Voluntary Peer Review process. UNEP/CBD/COP/13/INF/2

(a) *A number of Parties volunteering to participate in the VPR process.* In spite of having been formally adopted by the Conference of the Parties, of various notifications inviting Parties to participate, of the positive experience for those who have participated, of the dissemination of results through side events, and of information documents presented to the Conference of the Parties, the VPR process is little known to Parties and, to date, very few have volunteered to be reviewed or to serve on review teams. A specific consideration for VPR is how to encourage or incentivize more participation in this process which is proving to be a powerful capacity-building and implementation review exercise. During the consultations for the post-2020 framework, building in incentives or making the process mandatory were discussed as ways to overcome this;

(b) *SBI open-ended forum as an element of the planning, reporting and review mechanism, and the further refinement of its modus operandi.* The trial phase of the open-ended forum should help Parties to assess whether or not this particular form of country-by-country review would be a valuable addition to the multidimensional review approach under the Convention, and how it could complement the VPR process. The modus operandi used during the trial phase could be refined to enable more engagement by Parties, to allow participation of observers and stakeholders, to change the nature of the voluntary review reports etc. The results of a survey conducted on the trial phase of the open-ended forum were shared through a notification and in an online document¹¹ and could help to inform further consideration of its possible value added;

(c) *Peer learning potential of country-by-country review.* While VPR reports are shared with the broader community of Parties through information documents and side events, there is no formal mechanism for Parties that have not participated in one VPR exercise to engage with- and learn from the implementation experiences of other Parties. The open-ended forum may serve to complement the in-depth, small group, nature of the VPR exercise, with such an opportunity;

(d) *Linkages with means of implementation: capacity development, technical and scientific cooperation, resource mobilization.* The VPR has a strong capacity development, technical and scientific cooperation and resource mobilization role. This role could be enhanced through future iterations of the VPR and the SBI open-ended forum.

2. *Global monitoring and review of implementation*

23. The main function of the Conference of the Parties is to review progress in the implementation of the Convention. The Subsidiary Body on Implementation, the Subsidiary Body on Scientific, Technical and Technological Advice and the Open-Ended Working Group on Article 8(j) and Related Provisions assist the Conference of the Parties in carrying out this function. A review of implementation has been conducted at each meeting of the Conference of the Parties since the adoption of the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020 (as per the mandate of COP, and decisions X/2 and XII/31), including a mid-term review conducted during the twelfth meeting of the Conference of the Parties.

24. The Executive Secretary has prepared analysis/synthesis of national, regional and other actions, from the available national reports, national biodiversity strategies and action plans, and targets established in accordance with the Strategic Plan as well as other information (including scientific assessments) that has become available to enable the Conference of the Parties to assess the status of implementation and the contribution of national targets to the global targets. Guidance from the Conference of the Parties for policy development and to support implementation has been based on this review.

25. The *Global Biodiversity Outlook*, based on the national reports and scientific data, has contributed to the mid-term review of implementation and will contribute to the final review of implementation to take place during the fifteenth meeting of the Conference of the Parties. The International Science-Policy Platform on Biodiversity and Ecosystem Services (IPBES) released its Global Assessment Report on

¹¹ <https://www.cbd.int/doc/nr/trial-phase-survey.pdf>

Biodiversity and Ecosystem Services in May 2019, which has informed the discussions on the development of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework.

26. The Decision Tracking Tool was developed by the Secretariat on request of the Conference of the Parties to help Parties, partners and the Secretariat to track the status of implementation of decisions. This came in the context of discussions on the possible overlap of new decisions with existing ones, and the consequences on efficiency. The tool allows users to know if there is an existing decision on a topic, if so, what it consists of, and to what extent it has been implemented.

27. A few other observations related to the past approach which may be useful for considering in designing an enhanced global monitoring and review system include:

(a) As outlined above, among the weaknesses of the current global review of implementation is that it is based only those national reports and NBSAPs that are available at the time of analysis, and not on the submissions from all (or most) of the Parties to the Convention. This weakens the messages resulting from the review of implementation. A further weakening of the messages results from the difficulties in analysing, and hence drawing solid conclusions from the information in Parties' submissions (discussed above). Yet another weakness of the COP review of implementation is that although the resulting decisions have urged Parties and others to increase efforts and actions, there is no mechanism for Parties to communicate their responses, and for the global community to know if, and to what extent this has happened,¹² and if this response is commensurate with the global goals and targets. Finally, although the resulting COP decisions have addressed the United Nations General Assembly, the message of the need for enhanced biodiversity action may not be reaching the right decision makers;

(b) The Decision Tracking Tool has not been actively applied monitor and enhance implementation, increase accountability, and reflect on the development of COP decisions;

(c) The periodicity of meetings of the Conference of the Parties has implications for the periodicity of the meetings of the Parties to the Cartagena and Nagoya Protocols, and for the functioning of the Compliance Committee and assessment and review under the Cartagena Protocol.

IV. CONCLUSION

28. The present document provides a detailed analysis of the components and workings of the current multidimensional review approach under the Convention. Parties may wish to consider this analysis while reviewing document CBD/SBI/3/11 and deliberating on item 9.

¹² A recurring theme in the post 2020 consultations and submissions has been the idea of holding a periodic "global biodiversity stocktake" and to have a "ratchet mechanism" such as that under the Paris Agreement whereby Parties are requested to update their national commitments, increasing their ambition, in response to the global stocktake.