

Convention on Biological Diversity

Distr.
GENERAL

CBD/SBI/2/2/Add.2
13 March 2018

ORIGINAL: ENGLISH

SUBSIDIARY BODY ON IMPLEMENTATION

Second meeting

Montreal, Canada, 9-13 July 2018

Item 3 of the provisional agenda*

ANALYSIS OF THE CONTRIBUTION OF TARGETS ESTABLISHED BY PARTIES AND PROGRESS TOWARDS THE AICHI BIODIVERSITY TARGETS

Note by the Executive Secretary

BACKGROUND

1. In adopting the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020, the Conference of the Parties to the Convention on Biological Diversity invited Parties to establish their own national targets, using the Strategic Plan as flexible framework, taking into account national needs and priorities, while also bearing in mind national contributions to the achievement of the global Aichi Biodiversity Targets. Parties were also urged to review, and as appropriate update and revise, their national biodiversity strategies and action plans (NBSAPs), in line with the Strategic Plan and the guidance adopted in [decision IX/9](#), including by integrating their national targets into their NBSAPs, adopted as a policy instrument.
2. In its [decision XIII/1](#), the Conference of the Parties urged those Parties that had not yet done so to update and implement their national or regional biodiversity strategies and action plans as soon as possible, in keeping with [decision XI/2](#).
3. Between the tenth meeting of the Conference of the Parties and 14 March 2018, the Secretariat of the Convention on Biological Diversity received 154 new NBSAPs.¹ Of these, 15 represent the first NBSAP for a country. Further information on the update and analysis of national biodiversity strategies and action plans received after the adoption of the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020 is contained in document CBD/SBI/2/2/Add.1.
4. In adopting the Strategic Plan, the Conference of the Parties (decision X/2) also 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](#), the Conference of the Parties requested Parties to submit their fifth national report by 31 March 2014. Subsequently, the Subsidiary Body on Implementation, in [recommendation 1/1](#), emphasized that the effective review of progress towards the implementation of the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020 depended on the timely submission of information from Parties and, recalling decisions [XI/3](#) and [XII/2 A](#), urged those Parties that had not yet submitted their fifth national report to do so as a matter of urgency, and no later than 30 June 2016. By 14 March 2018, 191 fifth national reports had been received.
5. In decision [X/2](#), the Conference of the Parties requested the Executive Secretary to prepare an analysis/synthesis of national, regional and other actions, including targets as appropriate, established in

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

¹ The revised NBSAP of China was submitted in September 2010 and was developed with the draft Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020 taken into account. Germany submitted an action plan to 2020 for an NBSAP which had been developed prior to the adoption of the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020.

accordance with the Strategic Plan, to enable the Working Group on Review of Implementation of the Convention at its fourth meeting and the Conference of Parties at its eleventh and subsequent meetings to assess the contribution of such national and regional targets towards the global targets.

6. In response to this decision, the Secretariat has, in the present document,² updated the analysis of the contribution of targets established by Parties and progress towards the Aichi Biodiversity Targets made available to the Conference of the Parties at its thirteenth meeting.³ It complements a document issued for the Subsidiary Body on Scientific, Technical and Technological Advice, on an updated scientific assessment of progress towards the Aichi Biodiversity Targets and options to accelerate progress,⁴ which focuses on evidence of progress from the scientific literature and relevant indicators.

I. METHODOLOGY

A. National biodiversity strategies and action plans

7. In total, 154 revised or updated NBSAPs were considered in this assessment.⁵ The NBSAPs considered are Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Andorra, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Belarus, Belgium, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cabo Verde, Cambodia, Cameroon, Canada, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Czechia, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominica, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Eritrea, Estonia, Ethiopia, European Union, Finland, France, Gambia, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea Bissau, Guyana, Honduras, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kiribati, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Liberia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Montenegro, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nauru, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Niue, Norway, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Russian Federation, Rwanda, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Samoa, San Marino, Sao Tome and Principe, Senegal, Serbia, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, Slovakia, Solomon Islands, Somalia, South Africa, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Switzerland, Tajikistan, Thailand, Timor-Leste, Togo, Tunisia, Tuvalu, Uganda, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia and Zimbabwe.

8. Each of the NBSAPs was reviewed and national targets or similar commitments were mapped to the Aichi Biodiversity Targets.⁶ A total of 48 per cent of the Parties that had provided updated NBSAPs had mapped their national targets (or similar commitments) to the Aichi Biodiversity Targets either directly in their NBSAP or in their national reports. Where this mapping was done, it was used in this assessment. In those cases where this mapping was not done, the Secretariat classified each national target according to the Aichi Biodiversity Target to which it was most directly related. In situations where a national target was related to several Aichi Biodiversity Targets, this was also considered in the assessment by classifying the national target against multiple Aichi Biodiversity Targets. The national targets or similar commitments (such as national priorities, strategies, objectives or projects) were then assessed against the scope and level of ambition set out in the Aichi Biodiversity Targets. Further, any associated actions, sub-targets, biome or ecosystem specific targets related to the national target were also

² A version of this document was made available for peer review from 16 February 2018 to 12 March 2018. It has been updated to reflect the peer-review comments and additional fifth national reports and national biodiversity strategies and action plans received during this period.

³ [UNEP/CBD/COP/13/8/Add.2/Rev.1](https://www.cbd.int/doc/2018/02/16/cbd-sbi-2018-02-16-add.2-rev.1.pdf).

⁴ CBD/SBSTTA/22/5.

⁵ One NBSAP (Latvia) was not analysed as it was not available in an official language of the United Nations.

⁶ A comprehensive list of national targets, including targets contained in earlier NBSAPs as well as those reported in the fifth national reports, is available at <https://www.cbd.int/nbsap/targets/default.shtml>.

considered. The targets and similar commitments in each NBSAP were then classified into one of four categories:

(a) *National target surpasses the scope or level of ambition of the Aichi Target* – This category indicates that the national target or similar commitment is more ambitious than the Aichi Biodiversity Target. This could be because the target has higher quantitative thresholds or contains commitments which surpass those set out in the Aichi Target;

(b) *National target is commensurate with the Aichi Target* – This category indicates that the national target or similar commitment is broadly equivalent in scope and level of ambition as the Aichi Target;

(c) *National target is less ambitious than the Aichi Target or does not address all of its elements* – This category indicates that the national target has a lower threshold for certain issues or does not clearly address all elements of the Aichi Target. This includes targets which are significantly lower than the Aichi Biodiversity Targets as well as targets which have been mapped by a Party to an Aichi Target and for which there is no clear relationship between the two;

(d) *No national target* – The NBSAP did not contain a target or similar commitment related to the Aichi Biodiversity Target.

9. It is important to note that this assessment was conducted considering the scope and level of ambition of the national target against that of the Aichi Target. It did not consider the national circumstances of a country. Therefore some targets, which when compared to the Aichi Target, are lower than the Aichi Target may nonetheless be ambitious in light of a country's starting point. For this reason, this assessment cannot be used to draw comparisons among countries but, rather, only to inform a discussion on global progress towards the Aichi Biodiversity Targets.

B. Fifth national reports

10. A total of 191 fifth national reports were considered in this analysis⁷. Information on the status, trends and pressures on 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 classify national progress towards each of the Aichi Targets into one of six categories.

11. Approximately 46 per cent of the national reports contained an explicit assessment of progress towards the Aichi Targets. Where this was the case, the country's assessment was used but translated into one of six categories in order to allow for the information from all the national reports to be aggregated into a global picture of progress towards the Aichi Biodiversity Targets. In cases where assessments of progress were not undertaken, the assessment was undertaken by the Secretariat along the lines above.

12. The six categories used in this assessment, consistent with those used in the fourth edition of the *Global Biodiversity Outlook*, are:

(a) *On track to exceed target* – A target with this assessment indicates the national actions taken will allow for the criteria/thresholds established by the Aichi Target to be exceeded. In the case of those targets with quantitative elements this would mean that the identified threshold will be surpassed. In the case of qualitative targets, this would mean the different actions or conditions to be met have been or are projected to be surpassed;

(b) *On track to achieve target* – This category indicates that the actions which have been taken and the current status of the issues addressed by the Aichi Target suggest that the target will be met by the target deadline;

(c) *Progress towards target but at an insufficient rate* – This category indicates that progress towards the attainment of the Aichi Target has been made since it was established. The progress could take the form of actions being taken or actual improvements in the status of the issues being addressed.

⁷ All national reports which have been received by the Secretariat of the Convention on Biological Diversity have been considered. National reports have not been received from the Bahamas, Gabon, Iceland, Lesotho or Libya.

However, while this category indicates an improving situation, the progress that has been made will be insufficient for the target to be met by the deadline;

(d) *No significant change* – This category indicates that since the Aichi Target was set there has been either no significant progress towards its attainment or no significant deterioration. Assessments with this category imply that no significant actions to reach the target have been taken or are planned for the near future and that the overall status of the issues being addressed by the target have neither improved nor deteriorated;

(e) *Moving away from target* – This category indicates the issues the Aichi Target is seeking to address are deteriorating. This could be because no actions have been taken or the actions that have been taken have been ineffective. It could also be because pressures are increasing or other changes to national circumstances;

(f) *No information* – The report did not contain sufficient information to be able to assess progress towards the Aichi Target with any level of confidence.

13. It is important to note that the assessment presented in this note reflects the anticipated level of progress at the end of the Aichi Target date based on the status and actions as presented in the fifth national reports. As such, the categories indicate the current trajectory of progress and assume that this remains unchanged between the time that the national report was prepared and the target date. Further, this assessment does not consider national circumstances or baselines. Thus, the information cannot be used to compare progress among countries; it is only suitable for generating a global picture of progress towards the Aichi Biodiversity Targets.

II. NATIONAL TARGETS FROM NATIONAL BIODIVERSITY STRATEGIES AND ACTION PLANS ESTABLISHED IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE AICHI BIODIVERSITY TARGETS AND PROGRESS TOWARDS THE AICHI BIODIVERSITY TARGETS

Target 1 – By 2020, at the latest, people are aware of the values of biodiversity and the steps they can take to conserve and use it sustainably

14. About a quarter (27 per cent) of the NBSAPs reviewed for this analysis contained national targets or commitments which are equal to the scope and level of ambition set out in the Aichi Target.⁸ Target 1 is among those showing the closest alignment to the national targets in the NBSAPs. However, more than half (61 per cent) of the NBSAPs have national targets or commitments which are lower than the Aichi Target or do not address all of the elements of the Aichi Target. About 12 per cent of NBSAPs do not contain any targets or commitments related to this Aichi Biodiversity Target. The majority of targets appear to focus on increasing awareness of biodiversity. There are comparatively fewer national targets which address making people aware of the actions they can take to conserve biodiversity.

15. With regards to the national reports, 16 per cent of these suggest that the target will be met while more than two thirds (69 per cent) contain information suggesting that progress is being made towards the target but at a rate that will not allow it to be met by 2020. About 9 per cent of reports indicate that no significant changes have occurred and none of the reports suggest that awareness of biodiversity is deteriorating. The information in the national reports also suggests that both elements of the target (people's awareness of biodiversity is increasing and people are aware of the actions they can take) are being addressed by Parties; however, fewer Parties have actions directly related to making people aware of the actions they can take to conserve and sustainably use biodiversity.

⁸ Antigua and Barbuda, Austria, Belarus, Belgium, Benin, Brazil, Burundi, Congo, Cuba, Dominica, Equatorial Guinea, Estonia, Ethiopia, Finland, Guinea, India, Ireland, Japan, Lebanon, Luxembourg, Mali, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Republic of Korea, Russian Federation, Rwanda, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Samoa, Senegal, Serbia, Slovakia, Solomon Islands, South Africa, Spain, Thailand, Timor-Leste, Tuvalu, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, Uganda and Zambia.

Target 2 – By 2020, at the latest, biodiversity values have been integrated into national and local development and poverty reduction strategies and planning processes and are being incorporated into national accounting, as appropriate, and reporting systems

16. Only 6 per cent of NBSAPs contain national targets or similar commitments which match the scope and level of ambition set out in Aichi Target 2⁹ and one Party set a target which surpasses the Aichi Target as it has an earlier deadline.¹⁰ More than three quarters (78 per cent) of NBSAPs contain national targets or commitments which are lower than the Aichi Target or do not address all of the elements of the Aichi Target. About 16 per cent of NBSAPs do not contain any national targets or similar commitments related to this Aichi Target. Of the targets set, relatively few address the integration of biodiversity values into national and local planning processes, national accounting or reporting processes. The national targets that have been established largely focus on the integration of biodiversity values into national development strategies and poverty reduction strategies. Further many of the targets set relate to the issue of policy coherence and/or the integration of biodiversity into decision-making generally.

17. With regard to the national reports, less than 10 per cent of reports contain information which suggests that this target is on track to be met. More than 60 per cent indicate that progress is being made towards the attainment of Aichi Target 2 but not at a rate that will allow the target to be met by 2020. Further, more than a fifth (22 per cent) of national reports contain information suggesting that no significant changes have occurred since the adoption of the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020. Most of the progress that is being made appears to be related to the integration of biodiversity into national development and poverty reduction strategies and into national and local planning processes. By comparison, less progress is being made on the integration of biodiversity into national accounting and reporting systems.

Target 3 – By 2020, at the latest, incentives, including subsidies, harmful to biodiversity are eliminated, phased out or reformed in order to minimize or avoid negative impacts, and positive incentives for the conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity are developed and applied, consistent and in harmony with the Convention and other relevant international obligations, taking into account national socioeconomic conditions

18. About 11 per cent of the NBSAPs assessed contain targets which were similar in scope and level of ambition to the Aichi Target 3¹¹ and one NBSAP contained a national target which surpassed the Aichi Target as it had a deadline of 2017.¹² A total of 48 per cent of NBSAPs contained targets with a lower level of ambition or which did not address all of the elements in the Aichi Target. Many of these targets were general in nature and refer to incentives and subsidies broadly without specifying the removal of harmful incentives or the development of positive ones. Of the NBSAPs assessed, 40 per cent did not contain any national targets or commitments related to this target. This Aichi Target is among those with the lowest level of alignment with national targets contained in the NBSAPs.

19. Only 3 per cent of national reports contain information suggesting that this target is on track to be met. More than 40 per cent of fifth national reports suggest that progress is being made towards the attainment of this target but not at a rate that would allow it to be met by 2020. Almost 30 per cent of reports suggest that no significant changes in the progress towards this target have occurred, while almost one quarter (25 per cent) of national reports contained insufficient information to be able to assess progress towards this target. The information in the national reports suggests that there is relatively more attention on developing positive incentives than on removing or reforming harmful ones. Additional information regarding Target 3 is provided in CBD/SBI/2/2/Add.4.

⁹ Brazil, Congo, Finland, Georgia, Guinea, Samoa, Tajikistan, Togo and Zambia.

¹⁰ Guinea-Bissau.

¹¹ Antigua and Barbuda, Belgium, Bhutan, Brazil, Congo, Eritrea, Georgia, Guinea, Luxembourg, Mongolia, Namibia, Rwanda, Samoa, Swaziland, Tajikistan, United Arab Emirates and United Republic of Tanzania.

¹² Maldives.

Target 4 – By 2020, at the latest, Governments, business and stakeholders at all levels have taken steps to achieve or have implemented plans for sustainable production and consumption and have kept the impacts of use of natural resources well within safe ecological limits

20. Only 11 per cent of NBSAPs contain targets which are similar to the scope and ambition of the Aichi Target,¹³ while 65 per cent contain targets which have a lower level of ambition or do not cover all elements of the Aichi Target. About a quarter (24 per cent) of NBSAPs do not contain targets related to this target. Of the targets that have been set, few refer to keeping the impact of the use of natural resources within safe ecological limits. Most of the target set refer to sustainable use generally and do not specifically address sustainable production and consumption.

21. Only 3 per cent of the national reports contain information suggesting that this target is on track to be met by the deadline. More than half (54 per cent) of the national reports contain information suggesting that progress towards this target is being made but at a rate that will not allow the target to be met by 2020. Almost a third of reports (31 per cent) suggest that no significant changes have occurred. The progress that has been made appears to be more heavily concentrated on taking steps to promote sustainable production in general. By comparison, there has been relatively less progress on issues related to sustainable consumption and few reports contain information related to keeping the impacts of the use of natural resources at safe ecological limits.

Target 5 – By 2020, the rate of loss of all natural habitats, including forests, is at least halved and where feasible brought close to zero, and degradation and fragmentation is significantly reduced

22. Of the NBSAPs assessed, 6 per cent contain targets or commitments which have a similar scope and level of ambition to the Aichi Target 5,¹⁴ while 1 per cent contain targets which are more ambitious than the Aichi Target.¹⁵ Almost three quarters (74 per cent) of the NBSAPs contain targets which have a lower level of ambition or do not explicitly address all elements of the Aichi Target while a fifth (20 per cent) of NBSAPs do not contain any related targets. Most of the targets set refer to reducing habitat loss in natural environments generally. Most of the national targets that reference specific habitats refer to forests. However, mangroves, coral reefs, rivers, rangeland and marine environments are also mentioned but to a much lesser extent. Few national targets specify the extent by which the rate of habitat loss is to be reduced and few explicitly refer to habitat degradation or fragmentation.

23. Only 5 per cent of national reports contain information that suggests that this target is on track to be met. More than 40 per cent of the reports contain information suggesting that the rate of habitat loss is either unchanged or deteriorating, while a similar proportion suggests that progress is being made but not at a rate that would allow the target to be met by 2020. The information in the national reports suggests that equal attention is being placed on reducing habitat loss and habitat degradation and fragmentation.

Target 6 – By 2020 all fish and invertebrate stocks and aquatic plants are managed and harvested sustainably, legally and applying ecosystem based approaches, so that overfishing is avoided, recovery plans and measures are in place for all depleted species, fisheries have no significant adverse impacts on threatened species and vulnerable ecosystems and the impacts of fisheries on stocks, species and ecosystems are within safe ecological limits

24. Only 8 per cent of the NBSAPs assessed had national targets or commitments which were similar to the level of ambition and scope set out in the Aichi Target.¹⁶ More than half (59 per cent) of the targets in the NBSAP were lower than the Aichi Target or did not address all of the elements in the Aichi Target. This Aichi Target is one of the targets with the fewest number of NBSAPs which contain comparable targets. Of the NBSAPs assessed, 33 per cent do not contain national targets or commitments related to

¹³ Benin, Bhutan, Brazil, Burundi, Cameroon, Congo, Eritrea, Finland, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Indonesia, Mali, Russian Federation, Samoa, Somalia, Sudan, and Thailand.

¹⁴ Brazil, Cameroon, Congo, European Union, Japan, Malta, Russian Federation, Samoa, and Uganda.

¹⁵ Finland.

¹⁶ Brazil, Congo, Eritrea, European Union, Finland, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Russian Federation, Samoa, Solomon Islands, Sudan and Uganda.

this target. In most cases, the target is applied to marine fisheries. However, some landlocked countries have also set targets related to Aichi Target 6 suggesting that these national targets would apply to inland water fish and invertebrate stocks and aquatic plants.

25. Of the targets set, the majority focuses on issues related to ensuring that fish stocks are managed and harvested sustainably. By comparison, relatively few targets address issues related to avoiding overfishing, developing recovery plans for depleted species, ensuring that fisheries have no significant adverse impacts on threatened or vulnerable ecosystems, and keeping the impacts of fisheries within safe ecological limits.

26. Only 4 per cent of the national reports contain information suggesting that this target is on track to be met by the deadline. Almost half (48 per cent) of the national reports contain information suggesting that progress is being made towards this target but not at a rate that will allow the target to be met. More than a quarter (29 per cent) of reports suggest that there has been no significant change related to the attainment of the target. About 15 per cent of national reports do not contain sufficient information to be able assess progress towards this target.

27. Generally the information in the fifth national reports suggests that most of the focus has been on the sustainable management of fish stocks and on avoiding overfishing. More than 50 per cent of the reports contain no information on the implementation of recovery plans for depleted species, on keeping the impacts of fisheries within safe ecological limits and on ensuring that fishing activities have no adverse impacts on threatened species and vulnerable ecosystems.

Target 7 – By 2020 areas under agriculture, aquaculture and forestry are managed sustainably, ensuring conservation of biodiversity

28. Of the NBSAPs assessed, 9 per cent contain national targets or commitments which are equal to the overall scope and level of ambition set out in the Aichi Target.¹⁷ Three quarters of NBSAPs (75 per cent) contain targets which are lower than the Aichi Target or which only address some of the elements covered by the Aichi Target. A total of 16 per cent of NBSAPs do not contain any national targets or similar commitments related to Aichi Biodiversity Target 7. Comparatively few of the targets or national commitments in the NBSAPs related to this Aichi Target address issues associated with aquaculture. Further many of the national targets are related to sustainable management generally and do not specify agriculture or forestry.

29. Only 7 per cent of the national reports contain information suggesting that this target is on track to be met by 2020. Most national reports (57 per cent) indicate that progress is being made towards the Aichi Target but not a rate that would allow it to be met 2020. Almost a quarter (23 per cent) of reports suggest that no significant change has occurred. Of the information in the national reports there is relatively little on the sustainability of aquaculture. Both forestry and agriculture are relatively well addressed in the national reports and suggest that actions are being taken to address both issues.

Target 8 – By 2020, pollution, including from excess nutrients, has been brought to levels that are not detrimental to ecosystem function and biodiversity

30. A total of 14 per cent of the NBSAPs assessed contained targets or other commitment's which are similar to the scope and level of ambition of Aichi Target 8.¹⁸ However, more than half (58 per cent) of the NBSAPs contain targets which are lower than the Aichi Target and/or which do not cover all elements of the Aichi Target. More than one quarter (28 per cent) of the NBSAPs do not contain any targets related to Aichi Target 8. In the targets set, there is a slightly greater focus on reducing pollution than on reducing excess nutrients.

¹⁷ Afghanistan, Belarus, Belgium, Benin, Bhutan, Cambodia, Congo, Finland, Guinea-Bissau, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Rwanda, Samoa, Uganda and Zambia.

¹⁸ Austria, Benin, Bhutan, Brazil, Cameroon, Congo, Dominica, Eritrea, Finland, Georgia, Maldives, Mali, Namibia, Qatar, Rwanda, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Samoa, Solomon Islands, Uganda, United Republic of Tanzania and Zambia.

31. Only 4 per cent of the national reports contain information suggesting that this target is on track to be met. More than 40 per cent of the national reports contain information which suggests that progress is being made towards the target but not at a rate that would allow it to be met by 2020. A similar proportion of reports indicate that either no progress has been made (27 per cent) towards the target or that the situation is deteriorating (9 per cent). Relatively more reports contain information on pollution generally than on issues associated with excess nutrients.

Target 9 – By 2020, invasive alien species and pathways are identified and prioritized, priority species are controlled or eradicated, and measures are in place to manage pathways to prevent their introduction and establishment

32. This Aichi Target is among those with the highest level of alignment to the national targets in the NBSAPs. Almost one quarter (22 per cent) of NBSAPs contained national targets or other commitments similar to the level ambition and scope set out in the Aichi Target.¹⁹ Further, one NBSAP contained a national target which surpassed the Aichi Target as it has a deadline of 2015.²⁰ More than half of the NBSAPs (62 per cent) have targets which are lower and/or do not address all elements of the Aichi Target. About 16 per cent of NBSAPs do not contain any targets related to this Aichi Target. Many of the targets set by Parties are broad and refer to the control of invasive alien species generally. Further, many of the national targets set do not consider issues associated with the identification and prioritization of pathways for the introduction of invasive alien species.

33. Information suggesting that this target is on track to be met is contained in 3 per cent of national reports. Almost half (49 per cent) of the national reports contain information suggesting that progress is being made towards this target but not at a rate that will allow for the target to be reached by 2020, while a third (33 per cent) of the national reports suggest that there has been no overall progress towards this target. The information in the national reports suggests that most of the efforts taken towards this target have focuses on the control and/or eradication of already established invasive alien species while there has been comparatively less effort to put measures in place to manage pathways.

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

34. Only 8 per cent of NBSAPs contain national targets or other commitments which are similar to the scope and level of ambition set out in Aichi Target 10,²¹ and 50 per cent of the NBSAPs contain national targets or similar commitments which are at a lower level than the Aichi Target or which do not address all elements of the Aichi Target. A total of 42 per cent of NBSAPs do not contain any national targets related to this Aichi Target. This Aichi Target is among those with the smallest number of NBSAPs containing comparable targets. The established national targets are, for the most part, general, and few explicitly refer to coral reefs or other specific ecosystems vulnerable to climate change.

35. Only 3 per cent of national reports contain information which suggests that this target is on track to be met, while a third of reports suggest that progress is being made towards the target but at a rate that will not allow the target to be met. Almost a quarter (23 per cent) of reports suggest that no significant change has occurred while 7 per cent of reports contain information suggesting that the situation is deteriorating. Compared to other targets, relatively few countries provide information on progress towards this target. More than a third of reports (32%) do not contain information which allows for progress towards this target to be assessed.

¹⁹ Afghanistan, Belgium, Bhutan, Brazil, Cambodia, Congo, Cuba, European Union, Finland, Georgia, Guinea, India, Ireland, Japan, Kyrgyzstan, Liberia, Luxembourg, Mali, Namibia, New Zealand, Nigeria, Rwanda, Samoa, Solomon Islands, Sudan, Tajikistan, Thailand, Uganda, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Yemen, and Zambia.

²⁰ Sweden.

²¹ Antigua and Barbuda, Benin, Brazil, Cuba, Eritrea, Finland, Japan, Namibia, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Sudan, United Republic of Tanzania and Uruguay.

Target 11 — By 2020, at least 17 per cent of terrestrial and inland water, and 10 per cent of coastal and marine areas, especially areas of particular importance for biodiversity and ecosystem services, are conserved through effectively and equitably managed, ecologically representative and well connected systems of protected areas and other effective area-based conservation measures, and integrated into the wider landscapes and seascapes

36. Of the NBSAPs considered in this assessment, 10 per cent contained targets or commitments similar to the scope and level of ambition set out in the Aichi Biodiversity Target.²² A further 2 per cent of the NBSAPs contain national targets which were more ambitious than the Aichi Target.²³ More than three quarters (77 per cent) of the NBSAPs contain national targets which are either lower than the Aichi Target or which did not address all elements of the Aichi Target. About 10 per cent of NBSAPs do not contain any national targets or similar commitments related to the Aichi Biodiversity Target. Many of the targets referred to the improvement of the country's national protected areas generally. The greatest emphasis in the national targets was on expanding the size of the terrestrial protected areas estate. There was slightly less attention to the creation of marine protected areas. The more qualitative elements of the Aichi Target (ecological representativity, management effectiveness, protecting particularly important areas and interconnectedness) were also not as well covered by the national targets in the NBSAPs.

37. A fifth of the national reports suggest that this target is on track to be met by 2020. A further 67 per cent of reports indicate that progress is being made towards this target but not at a rate that will allow it to be met by the deadline. Only 7 per cent of reports indicate that no significant changes have occurred and no report indicates that the situation is deteriorating. Progress towards this target is among the most positive of the 20 Aichi Targets, but the focus by Parties appears to be largely on the expansion of terrestrial protected areas; comparatively few reports contain information related to marine protected areas. Further, more than half of the reports do not contain information on the ecological representativeness of protected areas or on the integration of protected areas into the wider landscape and seascape. In addition, more than a third of reports do not contain any information on protecting areas particularly important for biodiversity or on ensuring the effective and equitable management of protected areas.

Target 12 – By 2020 the extinction of known threatened species has been prevented and their conservation status, particularly of those most in decline, has been improved and sustained

38. Less than a fifth (19 per cent) of the NBSAPs contain targets which have a similar scope and level of ambition to what is set out in Aichi Biodiversity Target 12.²⁴ A total of 67 per cent of the NBSAPs contain targets which are either lower or do not cover all elements of the Aichi Target and a further 14 per cent of NBSAPs do not contain any national targets or commitments related to this Aichi Target. The national targets that have been set focus equally on preventing extinctions and improving the conservation status of threatened species.

39. Only 4 per cent of the national reports contain information suggesting that this target is on track to be met by the deadline. More than half (51 per cent) of the national reports contain information indicating that while progress is being made towards the target this will not be enough for the target to be achieved by 2020. Generally, there appears to be greater progress on improving the conservation status of species than on preventing extinction. However, the distinction between preventing species extinctions and improving the conservation status of species is not always clear.

Target 13 — By 2020, the genetic diversity of cultivated plants and farmed and domesticated animals and of wild relatives, including other socioeconomically as well as culturally valuable species, is maintained,

²² Belgium, Cameroon, Congo, Finland, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, India, Jamaica, Mexico, Samoa, Solomon Islands, Sudan, Uganda, United Arab Emirates and United Kingdom.

²³ Brazil, Cuba and Dominica.

²⁴ Afghanistan, Austria, Bangladesh, Belarus, Benin, Bhutan, Brazil, Cambodia, Cameroon, Canada, Congo, Dominican Republic, Eritrea, Finland, Georgia, Guinea, Hungary, Japan, Mauritius, Norway, Rwanda, Samoa, Solomon Islands, Sudan, Uganda, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland (England, Northern Ireland, Scotland), Venezuela, Viet Nam and Zimbabwe.

and strategies have been developed and implemented for minimizing genetic erosion and safeguarding their genetic diversity

40. Of the targets contained in the NBSAPs, 13 per cent had a scope and level of ambition similar to the Aichi Target,²⁵ and one NBSAP²⁶ contained a target more ambitious than the Aichi Target. More than half (63 per cent) of those targets set are either lower or do not address all elements of the Aichi Biodiversity Target. Almost one quarter (24 per cent) of the NBSAPs do not contain targets directly related to Aichi Biodiversity Target 13. Most of the targets set refer to conservation of genetic diversity generally. Few of the targets refer to specific elements of the target. In particular, the issue of conserving the genetic diversity of wild relatives, socioeconomically and culturally valuable species and the development of strategies to minimize genetic erosion are not generally reflected in the targets set by Parties.

41. Less than a tenth (7 per cent) of national reports contain information suggesting that this target is on track to be met by the deadline. More than half (53 per cent) of the national reports suggest that progress is being made towards the attainment of the target but not at a rate that will allow it to be met by the deadline. Further, more than 20 per cent of reports suggest that there is been no significant changes in relation to the attainment of this target. 16 per cent of reports do not contain sufficient information for progress towards this target to be assessed. Most of the focus on this target appears to be related to maintaining the genetic diversity of cultivated plants. More than half of the reports do not contain information on the maintenance of the genetic diversity of farmed and domesticated animals, and wild relatives. Almost two thirds (63 per cent) of national reports do not contain information on the maintenance of the genetic diversity of socioeconomically and cultural important species. Similarly, more than 40 per cent of reports do not contain information on the development of plans or strategies to address genetic erosion and to safeguard genetic diversity.

Target 14 — By 2020, ecosystems that provide essential services, including services related to water, and contribute to health, livelihoods and well-being, are restored and safeguarded, taking into account the needs of women, indigenous and local communities, and the poor and vulnerable

42. Only 15 per cent of NBSAPs contained targets which were similar in scope and level of ambition of the Aichi Target.²⁷ More than half (52 per cent) of NBSAPs contained targets which were lower or did not address all elements of the Aichi Target. Further, a third (33 per cent) of the NBSAPs assessed did not contain targets directly related to Aichi Biodiversity Target 14. Relatively few of the national targets that were included in the NBSAPs explicitly referred to taking into account the needs of women, indigenous peoples and local communities and the poor and vulnerable. Target 14 is among the targets with the lowest number of NBSAPs with national targets having a similar level of scope and ambition.

43. Only 3 per cent of reports suggest that this target is on track to be met by 2020 while more than half (51 per cent) of the national reports assessed indicate that, while progress is being made towards the attainment of this target, the rate of progress will not be sufficient for the target to be met by its deadline. More than a quarter of national reports indicate no significant change (23 per cent) or that there is movement away from the target (3 per cent). About 60 per cent of the reports did not contain any information on how the needs of needs of women, indigenous and local communities, and the poor and vulnerable where being taken into consideration in the actions being taken to reach this target.

²⁵ Afghanistan, Bhutan, Cameroon, Congo, Finland, Georgia, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, India, Mali, Mauritius, Mexico, Nigeria, Samoa, Solomon Islands, Sudan, Togo, Uganda, Zambia and Zimbabwe.

²⁶ Brazil.

²⁷ Afghanistan, Bangladesh, Belgium, Benin, Bhutan, Brazil, Cambodia, Congo, Eritrea, Finland, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Jamaica, Mali, Rwanda, Samoa, Solomon Islands, South Africa, Sudan, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay and Zimbabwe.

Target 15 — By 2020, ecosystem resilience and the contribution of biodiversity to carbon stocks have been enhanced, through conservation and restoration, including restoration of at least 15 per cent of degraded ecosystems, thereby contributing to climate change mitigation and adaptation and to combating desertification

44. Of the NBSAPs assessed, 3 per cent contained national targets which exceed the scope and/or thresholds set out in Aichi Target 15,²⁸ and 11 per cent of NBSAPs contained targets which were similar in scope and level of ambition to the Aichi Target.²⁹ More than half (58 per cent) of the NBSAPs contained targets which were lower or did not address all elements of the Aichi Target. More than a quarter (28 per cent) of the NBSAPs assessed did not contain any national targets or similar commitments related to the Aichi Target. The national targets that were set tended to have a greater focus on the restoration element of the target than on the element focusing on ecosystem resiliency and carbon stocks.

45. Only 4 per cent of the national reports contain information suggesting that this target is on track to be met, and 58 per cent of the reports received suggest that progress is being made towards the target but not at a rate that would allow it to be met by the deadline. No significant change was suggested in 17 per cent of reports, while more than a fifth (21 per cent) of the reports did not contain information which would allow for an assessment of progress towards this target. The information contained in the national reports suggests that slightly more progress has been made on enhancing the resiliency of ecosystems and enhancing carbon than on restoring degraded ecosystems. Few countries report on the actual areas of degraded habitat restored though several refer to ongoing or planned restoration projects or programmes.

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

46. About a fifth (18 per cent) of the NBSAPs assessed contained national target other commitments which were similar to the overall scope and level of ambition set out in Aichi Biodiversity Target 16.³⁰ A total of 50 per cent of NBSAPs contained targets which were either lower than the Aichi Target and/or did not address all of the elements covered by the Aichi Target. Almost a third (30 per cent) of NBSAPs did not contain any national targets related to this Aichi Target. Many of the targets that were set were general and referred to access and benefit-sharing broadly and several did not make an explicit reference to the Nagoya Protocol. This Aichi Target is among those with the largest number of NBSAPs with associated national targets.

47. Almost a fifth (18 per cent) of the national reports contain information suggesting that Aichi Target 16 is on track to be met. However, almost a quarter of national reports (23 per cent) contain information suggesting that no progress has been made towards this target, while 17 per cent of reports do not contain any information related to this target. About 40 per cent of reports contain information indicating that progress is being made towards this target but not a rate that would allow it to be met. The information in the national reports suggests that most of the progress made towards this target has been on ratifying the Nagoya Protocol. There has been comparatively less progress on ensuring that the Protocol is operational nationally. Additional information relevant to Aichi Target 16 in the context of assessment and review of the effectiveness of the Nagoya Protocol is provided in CBD/SBI/2/3.

²⁸ Gambia, Japan and United Arab Emirates.

²⁹ Austria, Belarus, Belgium, Belize, Brazil, Congo, Dominica, European Union, Guatemala, Guinea, Hungary, Jamaica, Luxembourg, Russian Federation, Samoa, Sudan Tajikistan and Uganda.

³⁰ Afghanistan, Albania, Antigua and Barbuda, Belgium, Benin, Bhutan, Brazil, Cabo Verde, Cambodia, Congo, Dominican Republic, Eritrea, Ethiopia, Finland, Gambia, Hungary, India, Japan, Jordan, Mali, Namibia, Peru, Romania, Samoa, Togo, Zambia and Zimbabwe.

Target 17 – By 2015 each Party has developed, adopted as a policy instrument, and has commenced implementing an effective, participatory and updated national biodiversity strategy and action plan

48. Almost one fifth (19 per cent) of the NBSAPs contain targets or other commitments which are similar to the scope and level of ambition set out in Aichi Target 17.³¹ More than a third (35 per cent) of NBSAPs contain targets which are lower or do not cover all elements of the Aichi Target. About half of the NBSAPs (46 per cent) do not contain any national targets or commitments related to this Aichi Target. This could be explained by the fact that, because countries have developed or updated their NBSAP, they did not feel the need to reflect this Aichi Target in their NBSAP. This Aichi Target is among those with the lowest number of NBSAPs with related national targets or other commitments.

49. More than one quarter of national reports (29 per cent) contain information suggesting that this target is on track to be met, while half of the reports indicate that progress is being made towards the target but not at a rate that will allow it to be met. About 13 per cent of the national reports suggest that no progress is being made towards this target, and 7 per cent of national reports do not contain any information on progress towards this target. This contrasts with the NBSAP assessment above, whereby a majority of NBSAPs did not contain any targets related to this Aichi Target. The information in the national reports suggests that most of the progress towards this target is on developing or revising the NBSAP. By contrast, there was less progress on adopting the NBSAP as a policy instrument. Additional information regarding Aichi Target 17 is provided in CBD/SBI/2/2/Add.1.

Target 18 — By 2020, the traditional knowledge, innovations and practices of indigenous and local communities relevant for the conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity, and their customary use of biological resources, are respected, subject to national legislation and relevant international obligations, and fully integrated and reflected in the implementation of the Convention with the full and effective participation of indigenous and local communities, at all relevant levels

50. Only 14 per cent of NBSAPs contained targets which were similar to the scope and level of ambition set out in Aichi Target 18³² and more than half (55 per cent) contained targets which were lower than the Aichi Target and or which did not address all of the target elements. Almost a third (31 per cent) of NBSAPs did not contain targets related to this Aichi Target. Many of the targets that were set were general. The main focus of the national targets centred on respecting traditional knowledge, innovations and practices and the integration of these in the implementation of the Convention. By comparison, there was relatively less focus on ensuring the full and effective participation of indigenous peoples and local communities.

51. About 15 per cent of Parties, in their national reports, indicate that this target is on track to be met. A further 42 per cent of Parties indicate that progress is being made but not at a rate that would allow the target to be met by its deadline. About 21 per cent of reports indicate no significant change. More than a fifth (22 per cent) of the reports reviewed did not contain sufficient information for progress towards this target to be assessed. Progress towards the different elements of the target is difficult to assess as more than 40 per cent of reports did not contain information related to them.

³¹ Albania, Antigua and Barbuda, Bangladesh, Bhutan, Brazil, Cabo Verde, Cambodia, Cameroon, Comoros, Dominican Republic, Eritrea, Gambia, Guinea-Bissau, India, Ireland, Japan, Mali, Malta, Mexico, Nigeria, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Solomon Islands, Somalia, Tajikistan, Uganda, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay and Zimbabwe.

³² Afghanistan, Brazil, Cambodia, Canada, Congo, Ethiopia, Finland, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Mexico, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Peru, Rwanda, Samoa, Somalia, Sudan, Tajikistan, Tuvalu, Zambia and Zimbabwe.

Target 19 — By 2020, knowledge, the science base and technologies relating to biodiversity, its values, functioning, status and trends, and the consequences of its loss, are improved, widely shared and transferred, and applied

52. About one quarter (24 per cent) of NBSAPs contain targets which are similar to the scope and level of ambition set out in the Aichi Target³³ and one NBSAP contains a target which surpasses it.³⁴ More than half (61 per cent) of the NBSAPs contained targets or other commitments which were lower than the Aichi Target and/or did not address all of the elements of the Aichi Target. About 14 per cent of the NBSAPs did not contain any targets related to this Aichi Target. The targets that have been set largely focus on increasing the amount and quality of biodiversity information available. There are fewer targets which address the sharing of biodiversity information and technology and even fewer which cover issues associated with the application of biodiversity information. Aichi Target 19 is among those targets that have the highest number of NBSAPs with associated targets.

53. About 12 per cent of Parties provide information in their fifth national reports which suggest that this target is on track to be met. A further 60 per cent of Parties provide information which suggests that progress is being made towards the target but not at a rate which would allow the target to be met by the deadline. There is comparatively little information in the reports on how biodiversity information is being applied in decision-making (49 per cent of Parties provide no information on this issue) or on how biodiversity information and technology is being shared (36 per cent of Parties provide no information on this issue). Overall, this suggests that most of the actions related to this target are focused on improving the amount and quality of biodiversity information available.

Target 20 – By 2020, at the latest, the mobilization of financial resources for effectively implementing the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020 from all sources, and in accordance with the consolidated and agreed process in the Strategy for Resource Mobilization, should increase substantially from the current levels. This target will be subject to changes contingent to resource needs assessments to be developed and reported by Parties

54. A fifth (20 per cent) of the NBSAPs contain targets which are similar to the level of scope and ambition set out in the Aichi Target,³⁵ and one Party set a target which surpasses the Aichi Target as it has an earlier deadline.³⁶ More than half (56 per cent) of the NBSAPs contain targets which are either lower than the Aichi Targets or which do not address all elements of Aichi Target 20. The targets that are set tend to be general and most do not refer to increasing resources from all sources or specify that resources should be increased substantially. Further, many of the targets that have been set also refer to non-financial resources, such as human resources. Almost a quarter (24 per cent) of NBSAPs do not contain any targets related to this Aichi Target.

55. Less than a tenth (8 per cent) of the national reports considered in this assessment contain information suggesting that this target is on track to be met. Almost half (47 per cent) of the reports contain information suggesting that while progress towards the target is being made, the target is not currently on track to be met. More than a quarter of national reports contain information suggesting that no progress has been made towards the target (26 per cent) or that the situation regarding biodiversity resources is deteriorating (3 per cent). Insufficient information to assess progress towards this Aichi Target was found in 17 per cent of national reports. In the national reports, there is relatively little information on the progress towards generating resources from all sources. Most of the information

³³ Argentina, Austria, Belarus, Benin, Bhutan, Burundi, Congo, Cuba, Egypt, Eritrea, Ethiopia, Finland, Gambia, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Equatorial Guinea, Ireland, Jamaica, Japan, Mali, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, New Zealand, Rwanda, Samoa, Senegal, Seychelles, Sudan, Switzerland, Tajikistan, Thailand, Uganda, Uruguay, Zambia and Zimbabwe.

³⁴ Brazil.

³⁵ Albania, Belarus, Belgium, Bhutan, Brazil, Botswana, Congo, Cuba, Egypt, Eritrea, Ethiopia, Finland, Gambia, Ghana, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Jamaica, Luxembourg, Mali, Nigeria, Samoa, Serbia, Sudan, Tajikistan, Uganda, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Zambia and Zimbabwe.

³⁶ Jamaica.

appears to be focused on increase resources from government sources. Additional information relevant to Target 20 is provided in CBD/SBI/2/7.

III. CONCLUSIONS

56. The majority of NBSAPs considered in this assessment contain targets related to the Aichi Biodiversity Targets, though for some Aichi Targets, such as Targets 3, 6, 10, 14 and 17, there were many NBSAPs without associated national targets or commitments. Aichi Biodiversity Targets 1, 8, 9, 11, 12, 16, and 19 were the Aichi Targets with the greatest number of broadly similar national targets or commitments. However, even in these cases, the number of NBSAPs with targets having a scope and level of ambition similar to the Aichi Targets rarely surpassed 20 per cent (see figure 1). Overall, the majority of national targets and/or commitments contained in the NBSAPs were lower than the Aichi Targets or did not address all of the elements of the Aichi Target. Generally, the national targets that have been set to date are more general than the Aichi Targets. Many Parties have set targets which refer to multiple Aichi Targets. These conclusions are similar to the analysis made available during the first meeting of the Subsidiary Body on Implementation³⁷ and the thirteenth meeting of the Conference of the Parties to the Convention on Biological Diversity.³⁸

57. The assessment of the information in the national reports indicate 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. Depending on the Aichi Target, between a third and two thirds of the national reports contain information suggesting that progress is being made but at an insufficient rate. Further, 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 target. The number of assessments classified as being on track to reach a target or on track to exceed it ranges between 3 and 29 per cent depending on the target (see figure 2). 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. The overall conclusion of this analysis is similar to that made available during the first meeting of the Subsidiary Body on Implementation. Further, this analysis is consistent with that that presented in the fourth edition of the *Global Biodiversity Outlook*, which, based on an assessment of 64 fifth national reports, concluded that between 53 and 92 per cent of Parties are not on track to attain a given Aichi Biodiversity Target.

58. It is important to note that the amount of information available for the assessment of the NBSAPs and national reports varied. For the national reports, information was available for almost all Parties. However, for the assessment of the NBSAPs, information from only about three quarters (76 per cent) of Parties could be considered and, thus, as more NBSAPs are received, the overall picture presented in this assessment may change. However, if the NBSAPs which are yet to be provided to the Secretariat follow a similar pattern to those already received, 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. The additional NBSAPs received between the thirteenth meeting of the Conference of the Parties and 14 March 2018 suggests that this may be the case.


59. 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 Biodiversity Targets and the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020, more generally, are to be met. The information from this analysis 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

³⁷ [UNEP/CBD/SBI/1/2/Add.2](#).

³⁸ [UNEP/CBD/COP/13/8/Add.2/Rev.1](#).


targets, progress is not currently sufficient to achieve the Aichi Biodiversity Targets and additional action is required to keep the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011–2020 on course.

Figure 1. Assessment of the alignment of the national targets and other commitments contained in the revised and updated NBSAPs to the Aichi Targets



Note: The coloured bars indicate the proportion of NBSAPs in each category. For ease of readability, the categories “National target has little relevance to the Aichi Target”, “The national target is significantly lower than the Aichi Target” and “National target is similar to the Aichi Target but at a lower level/does not cover all elements” were combined in this assessment”.

Figure 2. Assessment of progress towards each of the Aichi Biodiversity Targets based on information in the fifth national reports



Note: The coloured bars indicate the proportion of national reports in each category.