



Convention on Biological Diversity

Distr. GENERAL

UNEP/CBD/COP/13/12/Add.3
2 October 2016

ORIGINAL: ENGLISH

CONFERENCE OF THE PARTIES TO THE CONVENTION ON BIOLOGICAL DIVERSITY

Thirteenth meeting

Cancun, Mexico, 4-17 December 2016

Item 11 of the provisional agenda*

THE FINANCIAL MECHANISM

FOUR-YEAR OUTCOME-ORIENTED FRAMEWORK OF PROGRAMME PRIORITIES

Note by the Executive Secretary

I. INTRODUCTION

1. In paragraph 10 of decision XII/30, the Conference of the Parties at its twelfth meeting requested the Executive Secretary to explore and report on ways in which it could best utilize the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020 and the Convention's Protocols to set priorities for the financial mechanism within the context of the four-year framework of programming priorities for the seventh replenishment of the Global Environment Trust Fund (GEF-7), and to submit the report to the Subsidiary Body on Implementation for its consideration at its first meeting. In response, the Executive Secretary presented a preliminary analysis to the Subsidiary Body on Implementation for its consideration at its first meeting (UNEP/CBD/SBI/1/8).

2. In recommendation 1/7, the Subsidiary Body on Implementation requested the Executive Secretary to prepare, in collaboration with the Global Environment Facility, a draft four-year framework of programme priorities for GEF-7 taking into account, inter alia: (a) the biodiversity strategy for the sixth replenishment period, (b) potential synergies across the biodiversity-related conventions and the conventions for which the Global Environment Facility serves as a financial mechanism, (c) potential synergies between achievement of the Aichi Biodiversity Targets and the Sustainable Development Goals, (d) the global assessment of progress and the need to prioritize activities to fill gaps, (e) the needs expressed by Parties through the Financial Reporting Framework, and (f) the responses to the questionnaire from the expert team on funding needs for the seventh replenishment period, as well as the report of the expert team (para. 1 (a)).

3. The present note responds to this request. Section II of the note provides an analysis of the individual elements enumerated in recommendation 1/7, identifying implementation gaps and opportunities for synergies and resulting possible priority areas and outcomes. Implications for the development of the four-year outcome-oriented framework of programme priorities for the seventh replenishment period (2018-2022) of the Global Environment Facility Trust Fund are provided in

* UNEP/CBD/COP/13/1.

section III, while the draft four-year framework is provided in annex I, section A of document UNEP/CBD/COP/13/12.

II. ANALYSIS

A. Global assessment of progress

4. The following sources of information were taken into account in assessing global implementation progress against the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020 and its Aichi Biodiversity Targets:

(a) The fourth edition of the *Global Biodiversity Outlook*, including its general conclusions as contained in paragraph 1 of decision XII/1;

(b) The updated assessment of the global progress made in achieving the Aichi Biodiversity Targets contained document UNEP/CBD/COP/13/8/Add.2, as well as an analysis applying the same methodology undertaken for the subset of GEF recipient countries and provided in the annex to the present note (table 3).

5. The global progress in implementing the two Protocols under the Convention, the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety and the Nagoya Protocol on Access to Genetic Resources and the Fair and Equitable Sharing of Benefits Arising from Their Utilization is addressed in documents UNEP/CBD/BS/COP-MOP/8/5 and UNEP/CBD/BS/COP-MOP/2/5, respectively.

6. Based on these sources of information, table 1 below presents an overview of the results of the analysis, roughly in the order of the goals of the Strategic Plan and the Aichi Biodiversity Targets.

Table 1. **Global assessment of progress against the Strategic Plan and identification of gaps**

<i>Aichi Target(s)</i>	<i>Assessment of progress and identification of gaps</i>
<i>Strategic Goal A (addressing the underlying causes of biodiversity loss by mainstreaming biodiversity across government and society)</i>	
1, 2	While relatively good progress is being made on the ‘general’ elements of Aichi Targets 1 and 2, i.e. to raise awareness of the values of biodiversity and include these into national and local plans, biodiversity values are not yet widely reflected through concrete policy and behavioural change.
3, 4	Important implementation gaps can be observed with regard to Target 3 on incentives, in particular on addressing harmful incentives, as well as Target 4 on sustainable production and consumption.
<i>General comment on goal A:</i> GBO-4 found that achieving Strategic Goal A is critical to all other parts of the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity, while the priority actions identified in decision XII/1 also notes that attaining most of the Aichi Biodiversity Targets will require the implementation of a package of actions, typically including, inter alia, legal or policy frameworks; and socioeconomic incentives aligned with such frameworks, and that coherence of policies across sectors and the corresponding government ministries is necessary to deliver an effective package of actions. This suggests establishing a priority area dedicated to integration and mainstreaming, and to put emphasis on the further development of the institutional framework, including on ‘core’ biodiversity policies.	
<i>Strategic Goal B (reducing direct pressures and promoting sustainable use)</i>	
5, 6, 8, 9, 10	Most of the Aichi Targets under Strategic Goal B face important implementation challenges, in particular Target 5 on habitat loss; Target 6 on fisheries, Target 8 on pollution, in particular with regard to nutrient loading; Target 9 on invasive alien species, in particular with regard to preventive management of pathways; and Target 10 on coral reefs.

<i>Aichi Target(s)</i>	<i>Assessment of progress and identification of gaps</i>
7	Work on sustainable forestry and agriculture seems to be advancing, but falls far short of the target and there is little information on progress with regard to sustainable aquaculture.
<i>General comment on goal B: Across the individual Aichi Targets, implementation gaps seem to arise in particular with regard to marine and coastal biodiversity (see Targets 6 and 10, as well as the aquaculture aspect of Target 7).</i>	
<i>Comment of Targets 5 and 8: In line with the general comment on Goal A made above, taking effective action on Target 5 on habitat loss and Target 8 on pollution and nutrient loading, two of the targets facing particular implementation gaps, requires (sectorial) mainstreaming in order to achieve the necessary policy coherence, and this could be reflected accordingly in the four-year framework.</i>	
<i>Strategic Goal C (improving the status of biodiversity by safeguarding ecosystems, species and genetic diversity)</i>	
11	For Target 11, while there is substantial progress in expanding protected areas, further effort needs to be made in enhancing the management effectiveness of protected areas and in covering areas of particular importance for biodiversity, as well as the ecological representativeness, of protected area networks and their integration into the wider landscapes and seascapes, including by improving interconnectedness.
12	Important implementation gaps seem to persist on addressing threatened species (Target 12), which also relates to the limited implementation of Target 5 on addressing habitat loss.
13	Work on Target 13 needs to be further advanced, with more emphasis on the sustainable use aspects of this target.
<i>Strategic Goal D (enhancing the benefits to all from biodiversity and ecosystem services)</i>	
14,15	While restoration activities are under way in many countries, further to Targets 14 and 15 on ecosystem restoration, including in the climate change context, only a limited amount of recipient countries seem to be on track to achieve these targets and it is unclear whether they will lead to achieving the target to restore 15 % of degraded ecosystems.
16	On Target 16 (Nagoya Protocol), most progress made has been on ratifying the Nagoya Protocol, and less so on ensuring that the Protocol is operational at national level.
<i>Comment on the Protocols: The importance of support to achieving the two Protocols under the Convention could be reflected accordingly in the four-year framework, as an element of strengthening the institutional framework as called for in the priority actions identified in decision XII/1.</i>	
<i>Strategic goal E (enhancing implementation through participatory planning, knowledge management and capacity-building)</i>	
17	While progress is being made in reviewing and updating national biodiversity strategies and action plans, as per Target 17, continued support will be needed for suitable action in light of the successor framework to the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity, after 2020.
18-20	Support to achieving Targets 18 to 20 will enhance implementation of all the other Targets. There is, therefore, a continued need for such support in a cross-cutting manner.

B. GEF-6 strategic programming, in particular the biodiversity focal area strategy

7. In addition to the 10 programmes under the GEF-6 biodiversity strategy, programmes in other focal area strategies as well as the integrated approaches may also contribute, directly or indirectly, to achieve biodiversity objectives. The 10 programmes of the biodiversity strategy are grouped under four objectives, as summarized below:

1. Improve sustainability of protected area systems
 - Programme 1: Improving Financial Sustainability and Effective Management of the National Ecological Infrastructure
 - Programme 2: Nature's Last Stand: Expanding the reach of the Global Protected Area Estate
2. Reduce threats to globally significant biodiversity
 - Programme 3: Preventing the Extinction of the Known Threatened Species
 - Programme 4: Prevention, Control and Management of Invasive Alien Species
 - Programme 5: Implementing the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety (CPB)
3. Sustainably use biodiversity
 - Programme 6: Ridge to Reef+: Maintaining Integrity and Function of Coral Reef Ecosystems
 - Programme 7: Securing Agriculture's Future: Sustainable Use of Plant and Animal Genetic Resources
 - Programme 8: Implementing the Nagoya Protocol on ABS
4. Mainstream biodiversity conservation and sustainable use into production landscapes and seascapes and sectors
 - Programme 9: Managing the Human-Biodiversity Interface
 - Programme 10: Integration of Biodiversity and Ecosystem Services into Development & Finance Planning

8. In addition, the Focal Area Set Aside covers Convention obligations, global and regional programmes, including Integrated Approaches and the Sustainable Forest Management programme. Table 2 below provides a succinct analysis of the GEF-6 strategic programming against the conclusions of table 1 above.

Table 2. GEF-6 strategic programming

<i>Aichi Biod. Target</i>	<i>GEF-6 programme</i>	<i>Comments, including those on other GEF-6 Focal Areas and Integrated Approaches</i>
<i>Strategic Goal A (addressing the underlying causes of biodiversity loss by mainstreaming biodiversity across government and society)</i>		
1	1-10	Target 1 on awareness is taken up in a cross-cutting manner in all programmes.
2	10	Target 2 on integration is taken up by programme 10, on the integration of biodiversity and ecosystem services into development and finance planning. In the context of integrated natural resources management using a landscape approach, the Land Degradation Focal Area is also relevant.
3, 4	9, 10	Target 3 on incentives and Target 4 on sustainable production and consumption are explicitly addressed in programme 9 as well as in programme 10, on the integration of biodiversity and ecosystem services into development and finance planning. The later programme seeks to link biodiversity valuation and economic analysis with development policy, finance planning and fiscal reforms. Aspects of both targets are also addressed by the Integrated Approach on Commodity Supply Chains.

<i>Aichi Biod. Target</i>	<i>GEF-6 programme</i>	<i>Comments, including those on other GEF-6 Focal Areas and Integrated Approaches</i>
<i>Strategic Goal B (reducing direct pressures and promoting sustainable use)</i>		
5	1, 2, 9	Target 5 on habitat loss is addressed through programmes 1 and 2 on protected areas, as well as programme 9 on managing the human-biodiversity interface, under the objective of mainstreaming biodiversity conservation and sustainable use into productive landscapes/seascapes and sectors, noting that these also provide habitat to globally significant biodiversity. The Sustainable Forestry Management Strategy and the Integrated Approach on Deforestation and Commodity Supply Chains also address habitat loss.
6	6	Target 6 on fisheries is addressed, in part, by programme 6 on coral reefs. Some other aspects are addressed through the International Waters Focal Area.
8	6, 9	Target 8 on pollution is also addressed by programme 6 on coral reefs, insofar as marine-based pollution leads to damage to coral reef ecosystems. Reduced pollution could also be the result of more biodiversity friendly production practices, especially in agriculture, as outlined in programme 9. The Integrated Approach on Sustainable Cities could also contribute, as well as the Chemicals and Waste Focal Area.
7		Target 7 on sustainable agriculture, aquaculture, and forestry is addressed by programmes 7 (with focus on genetic resources) and 9 on managing the human-biodiversity interface, as well as through the Food Security Integrated Approach and the Sustainable Forest Management programmes.
9	4	Invasive alien species (Target 9) are covered by a dedicated programme, with provides emphasis on managing high-risk pathways as well as on islands and island archipelagos.
10	6	The central element of Target 10 (reducing anthropogenic pressures on coral reefs) is directly addressed by programme 6 on maintaining integrity and function of coral reefs.
Programme 6 also refers to fisheries management, thus contributing to Target 6 on fisheries. Programme 2 addresses the establishment of new protected areas and gives emphasis to the marine realm in its description. Sustainable aquaculture (Target 7), while not mentioned explicitly, could be covered under programme 9.		
<i>Strategic Goal C (improving the status of biodiversity by safeguarding ecosystems, species and genetic diversity)</i>		
11	1, 2, 9	On Target 11, programme 1 addresses improving management effectiveness and financial sustainability of protected areas, while programme 2 addresses the establishment of new protected areas, giving emphasis to the marine realm in its description, and referring to the IUCN key biodiversity area standards as criteria for defining globally significant sites. Programme 9 addresses the management of protected areas within productive landscapes and seascapes.
12	1, 2, 3	Target 12 on threatened species is addressed through programme 3, on combating poaching and addressing the illegal trade in wildlife products, with emphasis on elephants and rhinos, as well as through programmes 1 and 2 on protected areas.

<i>Aichi Biod. Target</i>	<i>GEF-6 programme</i>	<i>Comments, including those on other GEF-6 Focal Areas and Integrated Approaches</i>
13	7, 2	Target 13 on genetic resources is addressed by programme 7 on the sustainable use of plant and animal genetic resources. The programme emphasizes farmer management and the linkages to sustainable livelihoods in particular of indigenous peoples and local communities, gender considerations, and adaptation to climate change. In the programme directions, focus is however given on plant-genetic resources. Conserving habitat of wild crop relatives of species of economic importance is also covered by programme 2.
<i>Strategic Goal D (enhancing the benefits to all from biodiversity and ecosystem service)</i>		
14,15	9	Restoration as per Targets 14 and 15 is addressed in programme 9, while the relationship with climate change can also be covered through multi-focal area projects with the Climate Change Mitigation Focal Area Strategy, including the Sustainable Forestry Management Strategy.
16	5	The two protocols are addressed by dedicated programmes 5 (on implementing the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety) and 8 (on implementing the Nagoya Protocol on ABS).
<i>Strategic goal E (enhancing implementation through participatory planning, knowledge management and capacity-building)</i>		
17		Target 17 is covered through the focal area set-aside.
18,19	1-10	Targets 18 and 19 are covered by all programmes in a cross-cutting manner.
20	10	Aspects of Target 20 that relate to finance planning and fiscal reforms are addressed by programme 10.

9. It appears that many of the areas where additional efforts are needed, as identified in table 1 above, are already reflected in the GEF-6 biodiversity focal area strategy and the programming directions more broadly, including other GEF-6 focal area strategies and the Integrated Approaches. The four-year framework could build on this accordingly, in form of reiterated or reinforced emphasis on the relevant elements, while providing priority outcomes which focus on the gaps identified.

C. Synergies with the Sustainable Development Goals

10. The 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development sets out an ambitious framework of universal and indivisible goals and targets to address a range of global societal challenges. Biodiversity and ecosystems feature prominently across many of the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) and the associated targets. Table 4 in the annex provides a succinct analysis of the SDGs and their targets against the Aichi Biodiversity Targets.¹ The table shows that many Aichi Biodiversity Targets are incorporated in the 2030 Agenda and the SDGs. In addition to Goals 14 and 15, addressing, respectively, marine and terrestrial ecosystems, there are also important linkages, and potential synergies, with other SDGs, for instance:

(a) With Goal 2, on ending hunger, achieving food security and improved nutrition and promoting sustainable agriculture, through Aichi Biodiversity Targets 7 and 13;

(b) With Goal 3 on health and well-being and 6 on water and sanitation, through Aichi Biodiversity Target 14 (safeguarding and restoring ecosystems which provide critical services, including water-related services), and Aichi Biodiversity Target 8 on pollution;

¹ See UNEP/CBD/SBSTTA/19/INF/19 and UNEP/CBD/COP/13/10/Add.1.

(c) With Goal 12 on ensuring sustainable consumption and production patterns, through Aichi Biodiversity Target 4 on sustainable production and consumption and Aichi Biodiversity Target 8 on pollution.

11. Therefore, the implementation of revised national biodiversity strategies and action plans (NBSAPs) can make a potentially important synergetic contribution towards achieving the SDGs. At the same time, there is also a need to ensure that the implementation of the SDGs does not contradict, and is supportive of, the implementation of the revised NBSAPs. Effective institutional arrangements that link the NBSAPs and SDG implementation at national level will be important for ensuring this coherence.

D. Synergies with other conventions

12. Table 4 in the annex also summarizes an analysis of the synergies with other conventions for which the GEF serves as the financial mechanism, as well as with the other biodiversity-related conventions. With regard to the latter, the table also takes into consideration the advice submitted by the governing bodies of biodiversity-related Conventions pursuant to paragraph 2 of decision XII/30 and reproduced in annex II of document UNEP/CBD/COP/13/14. In a broad sense, implementation of the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity as a whole and its twenty Aichi Biodiversity Targets would support implementation of biodiversity-related conventions and of the other Rio conventions; therefore, and for the sake of maintaining focus, only the most direct synergetic linkages are summarized in the table.

13. The table highlights particular opportunities for synergy with biodiversity-related conventions, including in the context of the elements of advice received, through implementation of Aichi Biodiversity Targets 5, 6, 8, 11, 12, 13, and 16. At the same time, synergies with conventions to which the GEF also serves as financial mechanism, in particular with regard to the United Nations Convention to Combat Desertification (UNCCD), the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC), and the chemical conventions cluster, could be harnessed through implementation of Aichi Biodiversity Targets 2, 8, and 15, and through the GEF programmes for these other conventions.

E. Needs identified by Parties through the Financial Reporting Framework

14. In paragraph 1 of decision XII/3, the Conference of the Parties adopted targets for resource mobilization, including with regard to reporting on domestic biodiversity expenditures, funding needs, gaps and priorities (sub-para. 1 (c)). Funding priorities as identified by Parties in the financial reporting framework may be relevant for the identification of programme priorities.

15. As of 9 September 2016, among the 63 reports submitted, only 4 reporting countries also indicated annualized actions for priority funding (The Democratic Republic of the Congo, Egypt, Eritrea, and Malawi), including years in the GEF-7 cycle, while an additional 3 countries (China, Georgia, and the Philippines) provided general information on funding priorities. Several Parties made a cross-reference to the GEF-7 needs assessment questionnaire and the information they provided therein (see next subsection).

16. Even though the limited number of Parties providing information does not allow for statistical inference, the priorities identified by these Parties do not contradict the findings of the analyses above; for instance, foreseeing priority funding for implementation of one or both of the Protocols under the Convention, and six countries foresee priority funding for action related to alien invasive species.

F. Needs identified by Parties through the GEF-7 needs assessment questionnaire

17. In accordance with decision XII/30, the expert team on a full assessment of the funds needed for the implementation of the Convention and its Protocols for the seventh replenishment period of the Global Environment Facility circulated a questionnaire to gather national information regarding GEF-7 funding needs. The response to the questionnaire has provided indication of potential national demands for funding during the GEF-7 replenishment period. An analysis of the 200 project concepts submitted by 60 recipient Parties, summarize in Table 5 in the annex, shows that most project concepts address multiple Aichi Biodiversity Targets, rather than just one.

18. Bearing in mind this observation, some Aichi Targets with important implementation gaps seem to feature more prominently in the questionnaires, indicating that Parties plan to respond accordingly (i.e. on Targets 12 (threatened species), 4 (sustainable consumption and production), and 6 (fisheries), and to some extent 5 (habitat loss) and 9 (invasive alien species)). However, for some other Aichi Targets with important implementation gaps identified above, such as Targets 3 (incentives) and 8 (pollution), relatively low levels of financial resource needs are indicated by Parties. In the first case at least the low identified funding need may relate to the fact that the implementation of some Aichi Biodiversity Target is perhaps relatively inexpensive, or that it is expected to be implemented mainly through activities funded from other sources.

III. IMPLICATIONS FOR THE DESIGN OF THE FOUR-YEAR FRAMEWORK

19. The seventh replenishment cycle will cover the last three years of the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020, and the initial years of any successor strategic framework. From this perspective, the four-year framework needs to look both into the finalization of the current Strategic Plan and the (initial) steps towards the implementation of its successor agreement. This suggests including priorities where additional funding from the GEF will provide the necessary support to achieve those Aichi Biodiversity Targets which seem to be relatively within reach, in particular Aichi Biodiversity Target 11, while also prioritizing those critical areas with current implementation gaps, such as for instance Target 12. It is also important to foresee prioritized support for key enabling activities, in particular those which will become important post-2020, under a successor framework to the Strategic Plan. In so doing, the framework would seek to facilitate the replenishment of GEF-7 commensurate with the funding needs identified in the needs assessment.

20. Furthermore, the analysis above highlighted considerable potential implementation synergies with related multilateral environmental agreements, as well as with the implementation of the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development and the Sustainable Development Goals. Building on the unique institutional design of the Global Environment Facility, serving as the financial mechanism to several multilateral environmental agreements, the framework should enable to harness opportunities for synergy, for instance by encouraging integrated approaches to project design as well as global and regional projects. Regional approaches in particular are in some cases indispensable for addressing certain elements of the biodiversity agenda, such as migratory species. At the national level, such synergies can be harnessed through collaboration among national focal points of the Convention and its Protocols, of related environmental agreements, and of the Global Environment Facility, including through the projects supported by the Facility.

21. The priority actions identified in decision XII/1, further to the fourth edition of the *Global Biodiversity Outlook*, pointed to the importance of the overall policy framework and the need to promote policy coherence in order to achieve the expected outcomes. There seems to be an urgent need to strengthen policy and institutional frameworks at the national level. This suggests establishing a priority area in the four-year framework dedicated to integration and mainstreaming, building on, and further strengthening, programmes 9 and 10 of the GEF-6 biodiversity focal areas strategy as well as on the integrated commodities approach. This could include a focus at subnational levels, building on the GEF-6 Integrated Approach to cities, linking climate change and biodiversity priorities.

22. In this mainstreaming area, the progress analysis shows a need for enhanced implementation of Goal A of the Strategic Plan, emphasizing measures and tools that could lead to concrete policy and behavioural change and thus addressing Aichi Targets, or elements of Aichi Targets, with particular implementation gaps, in particular Targets 3 and 4. On Targets 3 on incentives, it is suggested to put the focus on harmful incentives, where particularly important implementation gaps were identified. Enhanced implementation in this area will also contribute to achieving Targets 6 and 7 on sustainable agriculture, forestry, fisheries and aquaculture as well as Target 20 on financial resources, while synergizing with the pertinent targets in the 2030 sustainable development agenda. Work related to Target 4 is suggested to focus on the greening of supply chains (reflecting the commodities integrated approach), but also

providing focus on cleaner production (reflecting the particular implementation gap of Target 8 on pollution).

23. The analysis also notes that implementation of some of the other Aichi Targets with implementation gaps could be advanced by more mainstreamed action at landscape or seascape level, and it is therefore suggested that these priorities be clustered accordingly. For instance, such an approach could be taken to further implementation of Aichi Biodiversity Target 5 on habitat loss, following the approach of GEF-6 programme 9, noting that such approaches could also facilitate achieving habitat connectivity and thus addressing issues related to the Convention on the Conservation of Migratory Species of Wild Animals (CMS).

24. A similar approach is suggested for continued work on agriculture, building on GEF-6 programme 7, and enabling continued synergy with the International Plant Treaty. Broader focus could be given on biodiversity that contributes to the sustainability of agricultural production systems, thus synergizing with, and complementing, Sustainable Development Goal 2 on ending hunger, achieving food security and improving nutrition, and promoting sustainable agriculture.

25. In addition, the analysis suggests an ongoing need for prioritized action on critical direct drivers of biodiversity loss, in particular on invasive alien species (Target 9), with emphasis given to proactive management of high-risk pathways, and on the multiple and interacting pressures on Coral Reefs and closely associated ecosystems (Target 10). There is also a need to continue the important work on protected areas as per Target 11, while providing more focus on remaining implementation challenges such as management effectiveness, ecological representativeness, and the coverage of sites of particular importance for biodiversity, including marine sites, and with special focus on sites that contain populations of threatened species. Continued support in this area could enable achieving this Aichi Biodiversity Target, which overall appears to be relatively within reach, as well as continuing achieving synergy with the Ramsar Convention on Wetlands and the World Heritage Convention. Moreover, there seems to be an urgent need, building on GEF-6 programme 3, to continue addressing the overexploitation of threatened species while continuing to synergize with implementation of the Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species of Wild Fauna and Flora (CITES) as well as the CMS issue of illegal killings of migratory species.

26. As mentioned, the priority actions identified in decision XII/1 pointed to an urgent need to strengthen policy and institutional frameworks at national level. In addition to continuing and strengthening work on integration and mainstreaming, this also seems to require the further development and strengthening of the 'core' biodiversity policy and institutional framework. It is suggested to address these elements in a separate priority cluster, bringing together priority outcomes for the further implementation of the Protocols with priorities for strengthened review of biodiversity planning, in particular anticipated work under the successor framework to the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020.

27. Last but not least, several key aspects or Aichi Targets, or elements of Aichi Targets, seem to be best addressed by a cross-cutting approach to project design. Thus, these elements should be integrated into each of the elements of the four-year framework, and be reflected accordingly, including:

- (a) Engaging all relevant stakeholders, including businesses, as well as indigenous peoples and local communities;
- (b) In this context, paying particular attention to the gender dimension;
- (c) Respecting, preserving and maintaining traditional knowledge, innovations, and practices of indigenous peoples and local communities, as well as their customary use of biological resources, with the full and effective participation of indigenous and local communities, at all relevant levels;
- (d) Being informed by improved biodiversity monitoring programmes leading to the use of up-to-date information on the status and trends of biodiversity;

(e) Achieving effective communication to raise public awareness and promote engagement, as an integral part of project design whenever critical for achieving the conservation and sustainable use of globally important biodiversity. In this case, it can also contribute to achieve more sustainable consumption patterns, as per Target 4.

28. The draft four-year framework of programme priorities for the seventh replenishment period (2018-2022) of the Global Environment Facility Trust Fund is provided in UNEP/CBD/COP/13/12, annex II, part A.

Annex

ANALYSIS OF PROGRESS MADE IN IMPLEMENTING THE AICHI BIODIVERSITY TARGETS IN GEF RECIPIENT COUNTRIES

1. The analysis provided in the fourth edition of the *Global Biodiversity Outlook* used inter alia the information provided contained in fifth national reports, global data sets and other scientific sources, in order to classify national progress towards each element of the Aichi Targets into one of six categories: (a) on track to exceed target; (b) on track to achieve target; (c) progress towards target but at an insufficient rate; (d) no significant change; (e) moving away from target; (f) and no information provided. The updated assessment provided in document UNEP/CBD/COP/13/8/Add.2 is based on a similar analysis of the 176 national reports received to date for each Target as a whole. It also provides an analysis of national targets or similar commitments contained in 99 revised national biodiversity strategies and action plans. While the information cannot be used to compare progress among countries, due to reasons spelt out in the document, it is suitable to generating an aggregated, global picture of progress towards the Aichi Biodiversity Targets.

2. For the present analysis, and with a view to identifying implementation gaps, the same methodology was applied for the subset of GEF recipient countries. In the list below, the Aichi Biodiversity Targets were ranked by the cumulative percentage of classifier (d) and (e) above (no significant change and moving away from target), thus providing a snapshots of those targets seemingly least on track in GEF recipient countries. Targets which had a similar cumulative percentage were grouped together. Only those reports were taken into consideration where information was provided in the first place. The list also points to those Aichi Biodiversity Targets with the least number of countries on track to meet the target, as well as particular implementation gaps identified with regard to specific elements of the target, using also, as applicable, the analysis already provided by GBO-4.

Table 3. Ranking of Aichi Biodiversity Targets by implementation success

<i>Rank</i>	<i>Aichi Biodiversity Target</i>	<i>Strategic Goal</i>	<i>Percentage (1)</i>	<i>Comments, including specific gaps</i>
1	5 (habitat loss)	B	54 %	Less than 5% of countries seem to be on track; aquatic habitats are mentioned but to a much lesser extent, compared to forests.
	8 (pollution)	B	53 %	Only 5% of countries seem to be on track; excess nutrients seem to be of particular concern.
	10 (coral reefs etc.)	B	53 %	Below 5 % of countries seem to be on track; relatively few national reports provide information thereon in the first place; and relatively few NBSAPs explicitly refer to coral reefs or other specific vulnerable ecosystems.
2	3 (incentives)	A	49 %	Less than 5 % of countries seem to be on track; there seems to be relatively more attention being paid on developing positive incentives than on removing or reforming harmful ones.
	9 (invasive alien species)	B	47 %	Below 5 percent of countries seem to be on track; most efforts seem to focus on the control and/or eradication of already established invasive alien species, comparatively less effort was reported on managing pathways.
3	6 (fisheries)	B	44 %	Below 5 % of countries seem to be on track.
4	4 (SPC)	A	39 %	Most progress seems to be related to promoting sustainable production, but less on sustainable consumption or on keeping the impacts of the use of natural resources at safe ecological limits.
	20 (resources)	E	39 %	Focus appears to be given on increasing resources from government sources.

<i>Rank</i>	<i>Aichi Biodiversity Target</i>	<i>Strategic Goal</i>	<i>Percentage (1)</i>	<i>Comments, including specific gaps</i>
	12 (threatened species)	C	38 %	Below 5 % of countries seem to be on track.
5	7 (sustainable management)	B	34 %	Both forestry and agriculture are relatively well addressed in the national reports and suggest that actions are being taken to address these issues. There is relatively little information provided on the sustainability of aquaculture. Many of the national targets are related to sustainable management generally.
	13 (genetic diversity)	C	33 %	Information is focussed on maintaining the genetic diversity of cultivated plants, less so on maintaining the genetic diversity of farmed and domesticated animals, and wild relatives.
	14 (restoration)	D	32 %	Only around 5% of countries seem to be on track
	16 (Nagoya Protocol)	D	32 %	Most progress made has been on ratifying the Nagoya Protocol, less so on ensuring that the Protocol is operational at national level. Most Parties to the Nagoya Protocol are still in the process of establishing ABS measures. Non-Parties are also taking steps towards ratification and implementation of the Nagoya Protocol.
	18 (traditional knowledge)	E	31 %	Relatively few national reports provide information thereon in the first place.
6	2 (integration)	A	26 %	Most of the progress made seems to relate to the integration of biodiversity into national development and poverty reduction strategies; less progress is being reported on the integration of biodiversity into national accounting and reporting systems.
	15 (restoration and climate)	D	25 %	Only around 5 % of countries seem to be on track. Restoration activities are under way in many countries, but it is unclear whether they will lead to achieving the target to restore 15 % of degraded ecosystems.
	19 (knowledge, science, and technology)	D	24 %	It seems that most of the actions related to this target are focused on improving the amount and quality of biodiversity information available.
7	1 (awareness)	A	14 %	It seems that there is less activity on making people aware of the actions they can take to conserve and sustainably use biodiversity.
	11 (protected areas)	C	11 %	While progress is among the most positive of the 20 Aichi Targets, the focus appears to be largely on the expansion of terrestrial protected areas but less on marine protected areas, and there seems to be less focus on the ecological representativeness of protected areas, on enhancing management effectiveness including the integration of protected areas into the wider landscapes and seascapes.

Note: As regards the Cartagena Protocol, the Subsidiary Body on Implementation at its first meeting noted slow progress in: (a) the development of modalities for cooperation and guidance in identifying living modified organisms or specific traits that may have adverse effects on the conservation and sustainable use of biological diversity, taking also into account risks to human health; (b) capacity-building for risk assessment and risk management; (c) socioeconomic considerations; and (d) capacity-building to take appropriate measures in cases of unintentional release of living modified organisms.

Source: Analysis of 140 fifth national reports submitted by GEF-eligible countries, based on the methodology used in UNEP/CBD/COP/13/8/Add.2

(1) cumulative percentage of classifier (d) and (e) above (no significant change and moving away from target)

ANALYSIS OF SYNERGIES BETWEEN IMPLEMENTING THE ACHI BIODIVERSITY TARGETS, THE SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT GOALS, AND OTHER CONVENTIONS

Table 4. Aichi Biodiversity Targets, synergies with the Sustainable Development Goals and with other conventions⁽¹⁾

<i>Aichi Biodiversity Target</i>	<i>Synergies with Sustainable Development Goals and associated targets</i>	<i>Synergies with other conventions</i>
1	Aichi Target 1 on awareness is reflected in target 4.7, under SDG 4 on education, and target 12.8, under SDG 12 on sustainable consumption and production, even though without explicit reference to biodiversity and ecosystems.	
2	Aichi Target 2 on integration is reflected in Target 15.9.	Measures to implement Aichi Target 2 on policy integration, such as measures related to sustainable land management policies or land-use planning systems, would synergize with the implementation of the United Nations Convention on Combating Desertification.
3	With regard to Aichi Target 3 on incentive measures, target 12.c addresses inefficient fossil fuel subsidies, while target 14.6 addresses harmful fisheries subsidies. Target 12.7 addresses sustainable public procurement practices, while target 15.b refers to providing incentives to developing countries for sustainable forestry management.	
4	There is a dedicated SDG on ensuring sustainable consumption and production patterns (SDG 12), within which target 12.2 addresses achieving sustainable management and efficient use of natural resources. Target 8.4 under SDG 8 on decent work and economic growth addresses improving global resource efficiency in consumption and production, and target 9.4 seeks to upgrade infrastructure and retrofit industries to make them sustainable.	Aichi Target 4 on steps to achieve sustainable production and consumption has potential synergy with all biodiversity-related conventions, chemicals conventions cluster, UNFCCC and UNCCD
5	Aichi Target 5 on habitat loss is addressed by SDG 15.5, by referring to action to reduce the loss of natural habitat. This target also includes prevention of threatened species by 2020 (which in turn relates to Aichi Target 13). Moreover, target 15.2 on sustainable forestry management is also relevant.	Implementation of Aichi Target 5 on habitat loss would support implementation of the Ramsar Convention on wetlands (wetlands as waterfowl habitat) and the Convention on Migratory Species, with regard to the latter in particular by putting emphasis also on reducing habitat fragmentation, for instance by linear infrastructure such as roads or railways. GEF-6 BS programme 9 already contains references to embedding biodiversity conservation in the management of productive landscapes and seascapes.
6	Within the dedicated SDG on the conservation and sustainable use of the oceans, seas and marine resources for sustainable development (SDG 14), targets 14.4, 14.6, and 14.7 address fisheries management.	Addressing by-catch in fisheries management would support implementation of CMS.

<i>Aichi Biodiversity Target</i>	<i>Synergies with Sustainable Development Goals and associated targets</i>	<i>Synergies with other conventions</i>
7	Aichi Target 7 on sustainable management of areas under agriculture, aquaculture and forestry is relevant to several SDGs. Target 2.4 under SDG 2 on ending hunger refers to ensuring sustainable food production systems and implementing resilient agricultural practices that help maintain ecosystems, that strengthen capacity for adaptation to climate change and other disasters, and that progressively improve land and soil quality. Target 12.2 refers to efficient use of natural resources. Under SDG 14, on the conservation and sustainable use of the oceans, seas and marine resources for sustainable development, target 14.7 refers to sustainable aquaculture. Target 15.2 refers to sustainable forestry.	Aichi Target 7 has potential synergy with all biodiversity-related conventions the chemicals conventions cluster, UNFCCC and UNCCD.
8	Target 14.1 addresses marine pollution of all kinds, in particular from land-based activities including nutrient-pollution. However, pollution in a broader scope is addressed in SDG 3 on ensuring healthy lives and promoting well-being for all at all ages. Target 3.9 seeks to substantially reduce the number of deaths and illnesses from hazardous chemicals and air, water and soil pollution and contamination. Moreover, SDG 6, on ensuring the availability and sustainable management of water and sanitation for all, includes target 6.3 on improving water quality by reducing pollution, listing various types of pollution or contamination.	Addressing marine pollution would support implementation of CMS. Marine-based pollution insofar as it relates to coral reefs is already contained in GEF-6 BS programme 6. Moreover, pollution issues are also addressed by the chemicals conventions cluster and the associated chemicals and waste focal area.
9	Invasive alien species (Target 9) are covered by SDG 15.8., which specifically refers to measures for prevention.	There is synergy with implementing the International Plant Protection Convention (IPPC).
10	The dedicated SDG on the conservation and sustainable use of the oceans, seas and marine resources for sustainable development (SDG 14) does not explicitly refer to coral reefs but includes references to addressing relevant drivers such as land-based pollution (SDG 14.1) or ocean acidification (14.3), while targets 14.4 and 14.6 address fisheries management and 14.7 refers to sustainable aquaculture.	Implementing Aichi Target 10 on minimizing multiple anthropogenic pressures on coral reefs and other vulnerable ecosystems impacted by climate change or ocean acidification supports the implementation of UNFCCC.
11	Within SDG 14 on the conservation and sustainable use of the oceans, seas and marine resources for sustainable development, target 14.5 reflects the marine and coastal target of Aichi Target 11. SDG 15 refers to ensuring the conservation of terrestrial and inland freshwater ecosystems and their services (target 15.1) and mountain ecosystems (15.4), but does not explicitly refer to protected areas or other area-based conservation measures. It does therefore not address enhancing management effectiveness or ecological representativeness of protected areas. Target 11.4 seeks to strengthen efforts to protect and safeguard the world's cultural and natural heritage	Implementing Aichi Target 11 on protected areas supports implementation of the Ramsar Convention and of the World Heritage Convention.
12	Aichi Target 12 on threatened species is addressed under SDG 15, on protecting, restoring and promoting sustainable use of terrestrial ecosystems, in target 15.5, together with measures to reduce habitat loss. Target 15.7 addresses poaching and trafficking of protected species of flora and fauna (see also 15c).	Implementing Aichi Target 12 on threatened species would support implementation of species-oriented conventions such as CITES and CMS. GEF-6 BS programme 3, with its emphasis on combating poaching and addressing the illegal trade in wildlife products, supports implementation of CITES and support to CMS on illegal killings more generally could be included.

<i>Aichi Biodiversity Target</i>	<i>Synergies with Sustainable Development Goals and associated targets</i>	<i>Synergies with other conventions</i>
13	Aichi Target 13 on genetic resources is well reflected under target 2.5 under SDG 2 on ending hunger, achieving food security and improving nutrition, and promoting sustainable agriculture. SDG 2 provides emphasis to ex-situ conservation (seed banks).	Implementing Aichi Target 13 on genetic resources would support implementation of the International Treaty on Plant-genetic Resources for Food and Agriculture. GEF-6 BS programme 7, on the sustainable use of plant and animal genetic resources, notes the important co-benefits for the Plant Treaty. Programme 7 supports on-farm management and strengthening production systems which allow continued evolution and adaptation of its genetic base, and also supports strengthening capacity for agricultural development, extension and research communities and institutions, as well as of community and smallholder organizations.
14	Restoring and safeguarding ecosystems that provide essential services as per Aichi Target 14 is reflected in targets 15.1 to 15.5 of SDG 15. With regard to services related to water, target 6.6, under SDG 6 on ensuring availability and sustainable management of water and sanitation for all, is to protect and restore water-related ecosystems by 2030.	Aichi Target 14 on restoration and safeguard of ecosystems related to water, health, livelihoods and well-being has potential synergy with the Ramsar Convention and other biodiversity-related conventions.
15	Under SDG 15, targets 15.1 and 15.3 are relevant, with 15.3 providing the linkages to land degradation and desertification. There is no explicit reference to carbon stocks.	Implementing Aichi Target 15 will directly contribute to climate change mitigation and adaptation (UNFCCC), as well as combating desertification (UNCCD)
16	The objectives of the Nagoya Protocol are reflected in target 15.6 and in target 2.5, making reference also to associated traditional knowledge, but there is no explicit reference to the Nagoya Protocol.	Implementing the Nagoya Protocol would support implementation of the International Treaty on Plant Genetic Resources for Food and Agriculture.
17		
18	Under SDG 2 on ending hunger, achieving food security and improving nutrition, and promoting sustainable agriculture, target 2.5 on genetic diversity makes also reference to associated traditional knowledge. Although indigenous and local communities are not explicitly mentioned in SDG 10 on reducing inequality, target 10.2 on empowering and promoting the social, economic and political inclusion of all can be promoted through implementation of Aichi Target 18. Target 16.7 refers to ensuring responsive, inclusive, participatory and representative decision-making at all levels. In a similar vein, target 1.4 could also be relevant.	
19	Under SDG 17, on means of implementation, targets 17.6 (cooperation on and access to science, technology and innovation) and 17.18 (capacity-building for data availability) are relevant.	
20	Throughout the framework, several targets refer to the mobilization of financial resources and this may provide entry points for synergy (1.a; 10.b; 17.3, 15a to 15c).	
The Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety and its objectives are not reflected in the SDGs.		
<i>(1) Notes:</i> Conventions include members of the liaison group of biodiversity-related conventions and conventions to which GEF serves as the financial mechanism. For an analysis of potential synergies with SDGs providing additional information, see UNEP/CBD/SBSTTA/19/INF/9 and UNEP/CBD/COP/13/10/Add.1.		

NEEDS IDENTIFIED BY PARTIES THROUGH THE GEF-7 NEEDS ASSESSMENT QUESTIONNAIRE

Table 5. **Reported projects concepts: linkages to thematic areas and Aichi Biodiversity Targets**

Thematic area of reported project concepts (reference to codes of Table 1)	Code	Number and percentage of reported codes
A. Biodiversity conservation on land and in coastal areas (mainly current GEF-6 Biodiversity Focal Area Strategy)		34%
Protected area networks and general species conservation (Aichi Targets 11 and 12)	710	82 (6%)
Terrestrial protected area systems: natural habitats and forests, mountains, drylands (Aichi Targets 5, 11, 12)	711	74 (6%)
Marine and coastal biodiversity and protected area systems (Aichi Targets 11 and 12) and sustainable fisheries in coastal areas (Aichi Targets 4, 6, 7)	712	66 (5%)
Coral reefs (Aichi Targets 10, 14, 15) and sustainable fisheries (Aichi Targets 4, 6, 7)	713	54 (4%)
Protected areas for island biological diversity (Aichi Targets 11 and 12)	714	28 (2%)
Conservation of threatened species (Aichi Target 12)	715	75 (6%)
Addressing invasive alien species (Aichi Target 9)	716	48 (4%)
B. Marine Biodiversity in international waters (GEF-6 Biodiversity Focal Area Strategy, International Waters Focal Area Strategy)		6%
Marine protected areas beyond national jurisdiction (Aichi Target 11)	720	18 (1%)
Sustainable fisheries on high seas and sustainable use (Aichi Targets 4, 6, 7)	721	33 (3%)
Transboundary Inland water systems (Aichi Targets 11, 12, 14)	722	26 (2%)
C. Restoration of natural habitats, ecosystems and their services (GEF-6 Biodiversity Focal Area Strategy, Sustainable Forest Management, Climate Change Mitigation Focal Area Strategy)		15%
Restore natural habitats (Aichi Target 5)	730	60 (5%)
Avoid forest loss, degradation and fragmentation of forests (Aichi Target 5)	731	49 (4%)
Restore essential forest ecosystems and their services (Aichi Target 15)	732	44 (3%)
Restore essential freshwater ecosystems and their services (Aichi Target 14)	733	35 (3%)
D. Sustainable use of biodiversity, production and consumption (GEF-6 Biodiversity Focal Area Strategy)		9%
Genetic diversity of plants and animals (Aichi Target 13)	740	52 (4%)
Sustainable production and consumption (Aichi Target 4)	741	63 (5%)
E. Pollution reduction (GEF-6 Biodiversity Focal Area Strategy, International Waters Focal Area Strategy, Land Degradation Focal Area Strategy, Chemicals and Waste Focal Area Strategy)		3%
Pollution reduction to biodiversity safe levels from agriculture, freshwater systems etc. (Aichi Target 8)	750	33 (3%)

Thematic area of reported project concepts (reference to codes of Table 1)	Code	Number and percentage of reported codes
F. Nagoya Protocol on access to genetic resources and benefit-sharing (GEF-6 Biodiversity Focal Area Strategy)		3%
Activities according to decision XI/5, annex, appendix 1; protocol implementation, national reporting, awareness raising, and capacity improvement	760	41 (3%)
G. Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety (GEF-6 Biodiversity Focal Area Strategy)		3%
Implementation of national biosafety frameworks, national reporting, capacity-building and improvement; ratification and implementation of the Nagoya – Kuala Lumpur Supplementary Protocol on Liability and Redress	770	40 (3%)
H. Capacity-building and cooperation (elements of GEF projects in different Focal Area Strategies)		11%
National reporting	780	26 (2%)
Country-specific resource mobilization strategies (Aichi Target 20)	781	16 (1%)
South-South Cooperation	782	10 (1%)
Biodiversity planning, integration and synergies (Aichi Target 2)	783	48 (4%)
Technical and scientific cooperation, transfer of technology (Article 16) and clearing-house mechanism (Article 18)	784	38 (3%)
I. Others as part of projects (elements of GEF projects in different Focal Area Strategies)		16%
Public education and awareness (Aichi Target 1)	700	68 (5%)
Traditional knowledge and customary use (Article 8(j) and related provisions, Aichi Target 18)	701	40 (3%)
Incentive measures (Aichi Target 3)	702	18 (1%)
Sustainable tourism	703	23 (2%)
Research and training (Article 12) and 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 (Aichi Target 19); Global Taxonomy Initiative; development and application of indicators and monitoring (Article 7)	704	56 (4%)

Source: Report of the expert team on a full assessment of the funds needed for the implementation of the Convention and its Protocols for the seventh replenishment period of the Global Environment Facility (see UNEP/CBD/COP/13/12/Add.2).