

Improving collaboration in the implementation of global biodiversity conventions

Katharina Rogalla von Bieberstein^{1*}, Elsa Sattout², Mads Christensen¹, Balakrishna Pisupati³, Neil D. Burgess^{1,4,5}, Jerry Harrison¹ and Jonas Geldmann⁵

Affiliations:

- ¹ UN Environment World Conservation Monitoring Centre (UNEP-WCMC), 219 Huntingdon Road, Cambridge, CB3 0DL, UK.
- ² Institut d'Urbanisme, Academie Libanaise des Beaux Arts, University of Balamand, Sin El Fil 55-251 - Beirut, Lebanon
- ³ UN Environment, Law Division (UNEP-DELIC), P O Box 33552, Gigiri, Nairobi, Kenya
- ⁴ Center for Macroecology, Evolution and Climate, Natural History Museum of Denmark, University of Copenhagen, Universitetsparken 15, DK-2100 Copenhagen E, Denmark
- ⁵ Conservation Science Group, Department of Zoology, University of Cambridge, Downing St., Cambridge CB2 3EJ, UK

* **Corresponding author:** Katharina Rogalla von Bieberstein; UN Environment World Conservation Monitoring Centre, 219 Huntingdon Road, Cambridge, CB3 0DL, UK.

E-mail: Katharina.Bieberstein@unep-wcmc.org

Running head: Biodiversity Conventions

Keywords: Aichi Targets; biodiversity-related conventions; Convention on Biological Diversity; multilateral environmental agreements; national biodiversity strategies and action plan; politics and policy; strategic plan for biodiversity

This article has been accepted for publication and undergone full peer review but has not been through the copyediting, typesetting, pagination and proofreading process, which may lead to differences between this version and the [Version of Record](#). Please cite this article as [doi: 10.1111/cobi.13252](https://doi.org/10.1111/cobi.13252).

Abstract

Eight conventions make up the biodiversity cluster of Multilateral Environmental Agreements (MEAs) which provide the critical international legal framework for the conservation and sustainable use of nature. However, concerns about the rate of implementation of the conventions at the national level have triggered discussions about the effectiveness of these MEAs in halting the loss of biodiversity. Two main concerns have emerged, lack of capacity and resources, and lack of coherence in implementing multiple conventions. Here we focus on the latter, outlining the mechanisms by which international conventions are translated into national policy, specifically the role of the 'Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020' and the associated Aichi Biodiversity Targets as a unifying grand plan for biodiversity conservation. This strategic plan has been used to coordinate and align targets to promote and enable more effective implementation across all biodiversity-related conventions. However, a survey of 139 key stakeholders from 88 countries suggested opportunities to further improve cooperation among the biodiversity-related conventions. The roadmap for improving synergies among conventions agreed at the 13th Convention on Biological Diversity's Conference of Parties in Cancun, Mexico in 2016 can help to address these concerns. Further, we suggest ways that the scientific community can actively engage and contribute to the policy process by: 1) establishing a science-policy platform to address key knowledge gaps, 2) improving data gathering, reporting and monitoring, 3) developing indicators that adequately support implementation of national plans and strategies, and 4) providing evidence-based recommendations to policy makers. This will be particularly important as 2020 approaches and work to develop a new biodiversity agenda for the next decade is beginning.

Introduction

As a response to the alarming and continuing biodiversity loss, combatting climate change, and more specific issues such as halting the depletion of the ozone layer, governments have collectively adopted a growing number of Multilateral Environmental Agreements or MEAs (Mitchell 2006-2016). All the world's countries are 'Party' to one or more of the agreements, and these MEAs, therefore, represent a globally coordinated approach to engaging countries in international decision-making and action.

While the reasons for the plethora of MEAs can be found in the history of the emerging international environmental policy agenda since the 1960s, the recognition of the associated challenges, often termed as fragmentation of international environmental law, triggered calls for mechanisms to achieve coherent implementation of MEAs in order to improve effectiveness and efficiency.

Steps to enhance cooperation and coordination among MEAs have mainly focused on thematic clusters of conventions (von Moltke 2001). This includes the cluster of the eight 'biodiversity-

related conventions', which cooperate at the secretariat-level through the Liaison Group of Biodiversity-related Convention (von Moltke 2001; Convention on Biological Diversity 2018a). These are: the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD); the Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species of Wild Fauna and Flora (CITES); the Convention on the Conservation of Migratory Species of Wild Animals (CMS); the Ramsar Convention on Wetlands; the Convention Concerning the Protection of the World Cultural and Natural Heritage; the International Treaty on Plant Genetic Resources for Food and Agriculture (ITPGRFA); the International Plant Protection Convention (IPPC) and the International Convention for the Regulation of Whaling which established the International Whaling Commission (IWC) (Table 1). With the exception of the CBD, which aims at the conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity, and the fair and equitable sharing of the benefits arising out of the utilization of genetic resources, the conventions are issue-based conventions, which address the preservation and use of a particular natural resource (e.g. wetlands in the case of the Ramsar Convention or natural heritage in the case of WHC) or in a particular context (e.g. species in trade in the case of CITES). As such they are part of the so-called first generation of MEAs (United Nations Environment Programme 2007).

The biodiversity-related conventions provide a critical international legal framework for the conservation and sustainable use of nature, which needs to be translated into policies and laws at the national scale, and by some regional bodies (e.g. the European Union), to have effect at the national (or regional) level. Ideally, they are also taken into account in working practices of companies and the work programmes of Non-Governmental Organizations (NGOs). Importantly, this international legal framework not only consists of the convention texts, but is also shaped by the adoption of decisions at the regular meetings of the convention governing bodies.

Concerns about the rate of implementation of the conventions have triggered discussions about the role of MEAs in halting the loss of biodiversity (e.g. Jóhannsdóttir et al. 2010; Di Marco et al. 2016). Two main concerns have emerged. First, many countries lack the resources, capacity and adequate legal instruments to respond to environmental obligations. Second, numerous convention-specific targets and lack of streamlining across the conventions may obscure a clear path towards the overall societal goal of halting the loss of biodiversity (Di Marco et al. 2016). 'Streamlining' in this context refers to the coordinated efforts to align targets and deliverables of the individual conventions to improve efficiency and avoid duplication of efforts. These concerns have led to a broad recognition of the need for enhanced cooperation in the implementation of the conventions at both national and international levels (UNEP World Conservation Monitoring Centre 2012; United Nations Environment Programme 2014).

In this paper, we first outline the mechanisms by which international conventions are translated into national policy and thus eventually action. We then outline how the *Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020* and the associated Aichi Biodiversity Targets (Convention on Biological Diversity 2010a) have been used as a mechanism to coordinate work across the biodiversity-

related conventions. We then present an analysis of the current challenges of coordinated implementation as viewed by National Focal Points (NFPs) and relevant authorities to biodiversity-related conventions. Finally, we outline current international processes to streamline national implementation of MEAs, and describe how this provides opportunities for science to inform and engage in global and national biodiversity planning processes. This relates not only to the implementation of the *Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020*, but also to the development and implementation of a post-2020 global biodiversity framework.

Strategic planning in MEA implementation

Starting with the Ramsar Convention's Strategic Plan 1997-2002 (Ramsar Convention on Wetlands 1996), strategic plans have not only been a key instrument for most of the biodiversity-related conventions, but over time also evolved into vehicles for enhanced collaboration among the conventions. All Conventions' strategic plans aim to provide direction and guidance for implementation at national and international levels, through the adoption of convention-specific objectives, targets, and indicators of progress (Hagerman & Pelai 2016). The first strategic plan designed with the recognition that it went beyond the interest of the respective convention, was the strategic plan adopted by parties to the CBD in 2002 (Convention on Biological Diversity, 2002). The 2002 CBD Strategic Plan and its 2010 Biodiversity Target became key planning instruments for the conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity globally through recognition of the Target by the World Summit on Sustainable Development (Convention on Biological Diversity 2002; Walpole et al. 2009), and its subsequent incorporation within the Millennium Development Goals.

Regrettably, the 2010 target was not achieved (Butchart et al. 2010; Secretariat of the Convention on Biological Diversity 2010). However, the lessons learned were instrumental for the subsequent *Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020*, adopted in 2010, including the 20 Aichi Biodiversity Targets (Campbell et al. 2014); (Convention on Biological Diversity 2010b). Besides being acknowledged by the UN General Assembly as 'the global plan for biodiversity' (United Nations General Assembly 2010), this plan was also the first to be recognized or supported by five other biodiversity-related conventions (United Nations Environment Programme 2015). Further, to support the implementation of the Strategic Plan, CITES, CMS and the Ramsar Convention mapped their strategic goals and targets against the Aichi Biodiversity Targets (Table 2) (Convention on Migratory Species 2014; Ramsar Convention on Wetlands 2015a, b). This created the opportunity for further cross-convention implementation at the national level, and facilitated information sharing and reporting. In addition, UNEP-WCMC has carried out a mapping of the articles and decisions of seven of the biodiversity-related conventions against the Aichi Biodiversity Targets in an effort to show how they each contribute to the achievement of the targets (UNEP World Conservation Monitoring Centre 2015).

Implementing the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity at the national level

Implementation of the *Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020* at the national level is principally through 'National Biodiversity Strategies and Action Plans' or NBSAPs – the key mechanism for the implementation of the CBD and called for by Article 6 of the convention (Herkenrath 2002; Adenle et al. 2015). This was reinforced by the adoption of Aichi Biodiversity Target 17 which stipulates that “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”. Recognizing the important role of NBSAPs as a basis for cooperation, the CBD and other conventions invited parties to involve NFPs of all relevant conventions (i.e. individuals or entities within countries linking national government to convention bodies) in both revising and implementing their country's NBSAP post 2010 (Convention on Biological Diversity 2010b); (United Nations Environment Programme 2015).

The role of the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020 in enhancing national coordination

Despite being the most widely endorsed conservation plan ever developed and adopted by governments, the extent to which the *Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020* and the most recent generation of NBSAPs have helped countries to coordinate implementation of the biodiversity-related conventions to deliver impact, has been scarcely studied. To help address this, a questionnaire-based survey was conducted by UNEP-WCMC in 2014, aiming to assess progress and challenges in implementing the biodiversity-related conventions. This survey targeted the aforementioned NFPs, along with other key stakeholders, eliciting 139 responses from 88 countries. (For details see United Nations Environment Programme 2014; United Nations Environment Programme 2015)

Sixty percent of the respondents indicated that the *Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020* and/or the NBSAP revision process had been used to promote and enable more effective implementation across all biodiversity-related conventions in their respective countries. In addition, over half of the NFPs (54%) stated that collaboration amongst focal points from different conventions played a positive role in implementing the biodiversity-related conventions. In particular, respondents highlighted the advantages of a common framework to guide development and implementation of new activities, initiatives and measures (reported by 81%) and the enhanced implementation of the conventions (reported by 59%).

The results of the 2014 UNEP Survey also showed that a variety of coordination mechanisms is already in place in countries. Over 70% of NFPs who responded to the survey reported that coordination mechanisms are in place to facilitate cooperation among NFPs. For example

Norway established in 2005 a Conventions Team as a formal coordination body consisting of the NFPs from CMS, Ramsar Convention, CITES, CBD, IPBES and WHC. Meetings are held regularly about 3-5 times per year and the Team aims to integrate the international conventions into the strategic agenda of the Norwegian Environmental Agency. Its Terms of Reference give it a mandate to develop effective interfaces between conventions and agreements, promote synergy and avoid duplication. A different approach has been adopted in Palau with the Conservation Consortium as an informal group comprised of representatives from government agencies and civil society, including traditional leaders. The Consortium supplements the work of formally-established national committees such as the Palau National Resources Council. Although originally only comprised of people working in the area of conservation, the Consortium has become multidisciplinary, open to members from other sectors such as energy, infrastructure and business. Initially the Consortium's purpose was information sharing between people conducting various environmental projects within Palau, but over time its remit has expanded, including adopting the role of a forum for NFPs of the biodiversity-related conventions.

However, despite the overall positive attitude from NFP towards the role of the *Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020* as a streamlining mechanism, 80% of survey respondents suggested that there were opportunities to further improve cooperation in implementing the biodiversity-related conventions. Challenges impeding progress included: 1) location of NFPs for different conventions in different government ministries and agencies which reduces collaboration; 2) a lack of cooperation mechanisms among NFPs and other key stakeholders involved in the implementation of the conventions, linked to regulatory barriers/ weak collaboration among state agencies; 3) a general lack of knowledge of how to implement the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity and NBSAPs; and 4) insufficient resources for NFPs to fully address all their responsibilities. Additionally, respondents recognized that there are limits to the degree that conventions can collaborate on all issues, given the different mandates of the various conventions, (e.g. to conserve migratory species throughout their range (CMS), or to ensure the conservation and wise use of wetlands (Ramsar Convention)).

These challenges illustrate the simple fact that cross-convention planning through the NBSAP process does not and also cannot replace planning processes for the implementation of conventions other than the CBD. Instead, the engagement in the NBSAP process is added to the list of responsibilities of NFPs from other biodiversity-related conventions. There is therefore the likelihood that the NBSAP process is perceived to be of lower priority than the obligations directly related to objectives of each individual convention, including the development of convention-specific implementation strategies and plans.

Recent approaches to improving cooperation

The value of developing collaboration and cooperation in implementing the biodiversity-related conventions has long been recognized, and, as a result, is a regular agenda item at meetings of the governing bodies of each convention. In addition a number of mechanisms, initiatives and projects have been implemented to foster cooperation and collaboration among the biodiversity-related conventions (For a detailed overview see United Nations Environment Programme and Convention on Biological Diversity 2018). This includes, for example, the aforementioned Liaison Group of Biodiversity-related Convention and the UN Environment project on "Improving the effectiveness of and cooperation among biodiversity-related conventions and exploring opportunities for further synergies", which generated several of the UN Environment reports cited in this article, as well as the subsequent UN Environment project on "Realizing Synergies for Biodiversity". However, there has been some concern that progress has been too slow. Therefore in the lead up to the 13th Conference of the Parties (COP) to the CBD held in Cancun, Mexico in December 2016, parties and secretariats representing all of the biodiversity-related conventions worked together to identify opportunities for further action. These deliberations led to a substantive CBD COP decision that includes national options for actions and a roadmap for improving synergies between conventions at the international level, as detailed in two annexes to the decision. (Convention on Biological Diversity 2016).

Annex I sets out "options for enhancing synergies among the biodiversity-related conventions at the national level". Recognizing that "coordination mechanisms and coordinated actions serve as the foundation for enhancing coherence and synergies [...] across all issue areas", the options identified include the establishment, or strengthening, of a formal mechanism for the efficient coordination among NFPs and relevant authorities of biodiversity-related conventions. Specifically, these coordination mechanisms can play important roles with regard to: 1) management of information and knowledge, 2) national reporting, 3) monitoring and indicators, 4) communication and awareness-raising, 5) science-policy interface, 6) capacity-building and 7) resource mobilization and utilization. The options identified place no specific obligations on governments because the CBD lacks the authority to prescribe specific implementation measures. Instead, it is recognized that agreed policy objectives need to be implemented by taking into account national circumstances. However, the options identified in Annex I provide a powerful framework for governments and external organizations to prioritize actions and to support activities financially, technically, or through the generation of knowledge.

Annex II to this decision provides a "road map for enhancing synergies among the biodiversity-related conventions at the international level", and details specific actions focused on supporting national implementation. The road map includes measures for enhancing synergies among the biodiversity-related conventions at the international level in three areas: 1) cooperation and coordination mechanisms; 2) management of and avoiding duplication related to information and knowledge, national reporting, monitoring and indicators; and 3) capacity building. Importantly, the Annexes list desirable key actions and suggest a timeline. As also

highlighted in the decision on the road map, the implementation of these actions up to 2020 will foremost depend on the governing bodies of the biodiversity-related conventions, including the CBD, and international organizations. To ensure a party-driven process to advance the synergies agenda and thus the likelihood of substantive outcomes at the subsequent CBD COP 14, which takes place in November 2018, an informal advisory group consisting of parties to the CBD was established. This was tasked to further prioritize the actions included in the roadmap as well as providing advice on their implementation, and will report on this work in November.

At first glance, the two annexes might not seem innovative, but the endorsement of activities by governments as being significant actions for building cooperation and synergies in the implementation of MEAs is valuable in promoting further action at both national and international levels. Furthermore, the adoption of the decision illustrates once more the role of the CBD as a driver for synergies among the biodiversity-related conventions; including through its pivotal role in convening the Biodiversity-Liaison Group (which comprises the heads of the Secretariats of each of the biodiversity-related conventions).

Roles for scientists

The two annexes of the CBD COP decision on cooperation (Convention on Biological Diversity 2016) suggest that scientists can help to improve synergies among biodiversity-related conventions at the national level by 1) establishing a science-policy platform to promote and facilitate the generation and use of best available knowledge; 2) improving data gathering, reporting and monitoring, including building more effective mechanisms for managing, sharing and using data; 3) developing indicators that adequately support implementation of national plans and strategies that can be used across all the biodiversity-related conventions; and 4) providing recommendations based on results accompanied with evidence for successful approaches and making biodiversity data more accessible for policy makers. These suggestions complement existing science-policy instruments or mechanisms at global level, such as The Intergovernmental Science-Policy Platform on Biodiversity and Ecosystem Services (IPBES) which has been established to serve the needs of all the biodiversity-related conventions, as well as the Biodiversity Indicators Partnership (BIP), established to promote and coordinate the development and delivery of biodiversity indicators for use by the CBD as well as the other biodiversity-related conventions. Thus, the four suggestions outlined in the annexes of the CBD COP decision on cooperation (Convention on Biological Diversity 2016) will complement and support existing efforts to engage with the scientific community.

We see these four items as hugely important and encourage scientists to engage in the process of improving synergies among biodiversity-related conventions as well as to engage with IPBES and the activities that it promotes. This may require research institutions and universities to acknowledge the added value of such contributions and ensure that researchers have time and

opportunities to engage in this work as part of their job. If not, we see a danger that many relevant people will not engage, and the process will be weaker as a result. Further, these priorities need to be acknowledged by government and private funding bodies to ensure appropriate allocation of resources. This will likely also require cross-institutional collaboration to ensure nationally and internationally coherent solutions. If done wisely this research agenda will not only contribute towards addressing the specific actions identified by CBD parties, but would more broadly support the conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity and ecosystem services, and illustrate a way forwards for large-scale research and data collection within the biological and earth sciences.

Beyond Aichi

Any research on cooperation among biodiversity-related conventions will also inform the negotiations on the post-2020 biodiversity framework, which will be agreed by governments at CBD COP 15 in Beijing, China in 2020, and will succeed the current *Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020*. The process for developing this framework has yet to be agreed, but will be a main objective at the CBD COP 14 in Sharm El-Sheikh, Egypt in November 2018. It will be important that the post-2020 global biodiversity framework be developed through a participatory process that involves a wide range of stakeholders and also engage closely with the other biodiversity-related conventions. This will indeed be key to further building the involvement of the other biodiversity-related conventions, their ownership of the outcome, and ultimately further efforts to ensure coherent implementation at the national level.

Thus we see the next two years as critical, with decisions to be made about the process and direction for the post-2020 agenda for biodiversity. Development of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework will need a solid evidence base (See for example Convention on Biological Diversity 2018b), and to be based on thorough review of progress in achieving the Aichi Biodiversity Targets. The CBD Secretariat has started inviting submission of initial views on the scope and content of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework, including on the scientific underpinning of the scale and scope of actions necessary. Consultation will continue into 2019 with multiple opportunities for all stakeholders to make input.

The 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development (United Nations General Assembly 2015) will be particularly relevant as the post-2020 agenda for biodiversity is being developed, both because of the importance of biodiversity and ecosystem services in achieving the Sustainable Development Goals, and because a number of the targets in the 2030 Agenda are derived from the Aichi Biodiversity Targets and therefore have a target date of 2020 (Schultz et al. 2016; Convention on Biological Diversity 2017). With respect to synergies among biodiversity-related conventions, generally, more streamlined national implementation will help put more emphasis on biodiversity in national development planning for achievement of the Sustainable

Development Goals. With regard to national implementation of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework, and in order to avoid time-lags between adoption and implementation at the national level, ideas that are being explored include the suggestion that parties to the CBD might begin considering their national commitments in advance of the formal adoption of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework. This could and should include implementation of actions relevant to cooperation in implementing the biodiversity-related conventions.

Acknowledgments

The article draws from a UN Environment project, implemented in 2014 and 2015 and funded by the European Union and the Government of Switzerland and we would like to thank the 139 people from 88 countries who completed the survey. We thank UNEP-WCMC for institutional support. This work was supported by VILLUM FONDEN (VKR023371) and the EU Marie Skłodowska-Curie action (H2020-MSCA-IF-2015-706784).

References

- Adenle AA, Stevens C, Bridgewater P. 2015. Global conservation and management of biodiversity in developing countries: An opportunity for a new approach. *Environmental Science & Policy* **45**:104-108.
- Butchart SHM, et al. 2010. Global Biodiversity: Indicators of Recent Declines. *Science* **328**:1164-1168.
- Campbell LM, Hagerman S, Gray NJ. 2014. Producing Targets for Conservation: Science and Politics at the Tenth Conference of the Parties to the Convention on Biological Diversity. *Global Environmental Politics* **14**:41-63.
- Convention on Biological Diversity. 2002. Decision VI/26: Strategic Plan for the Convention on Biological Diversity. the Hague, Netherlands.
- Convention on Biological Diversity. 2010a. Decision X/2: Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020. Nagoya, Japan.
- Convention on Biological Diversity. 2010b. Decision X/6: Integration of biodiversity into poverty eradication and development. Nagoya, Japan.
- Convention on Biological Diversity. 2016. Decision XIII/24: Cooperation with other conventions and international organizations. Cancun, Mexico.
- Convention on Biological Diversity. 2017. Working document CBD/SBSTTA/21/2/ADD1: Biodiversity and the 2030 agenda for sustainable development. Montreal, Canada.

- Convention on Biological Diversity. 2018a. Biodiversity-related Conventions, Available from <https://www.cbd.int/brc/> (accessed 17 Jul 2018).
- Convention on Biological Diversity. 2018b. Information document CBD/SBSTTA/22/INF/31: Effective use of knowledge in developing the post-2020 global biodiversity framework. Montreal, Canada.
- Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species of Wild Fauna and Flora. 2016. Revised mapping of the CITES Strategic Vision: 2008–2020 objectives and the Aichi Targets in the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2010-2020.
- Convention on Migratory Species. 2014. Resolution 11.2: The Strategic Plan for Migratory Species 2015-2023. Programme UNE, Nairobi, Kenya.
- Di Marco M, Butchart SHM, Visconti P, Buchanan GM, Ficetola GF, Rondinini C. 2016. Synergies and trade-offs in achieving global biodiversity targets. *Conservation Biology* **30**:189-195.
- Hagerman SM, Pelai R. 2016. "As Far as Possible and as Appropriate": Implementing the Aichi Biodiversity Targets. *Conservation Letters* **9**:469-478.
- Herkenrath P. 2002. The Implementation of the Convention on Biological Diversity – A Non-Government Perspective Ten Years On. *RECIEL* **11**:29-37.
- Jóhannsdóttir A, Cresswell I, Bridgewater P. 2010. The Current Framework for International Governance of Biodiversity: Is It Doing More Harm Than Good? *Review of European Community & International Environmental Law* **19**:139-149.
- Mitchell RB. 2006-2016. International Environmental Agreements (IEA) Database Project. Oregon, USA.
- Ramsar Convention on Wetlands. 1996. Strategic Plan 1997-2002. Brisbane, Australia.
- Ramsar Convention on Wetlands. 2015a. The 4th Strategic Plan 2016–2024. Punta del Este, Uruguay.
- Ramsar Convention on Wetlands. 2015b. Resolution XII.2: The Ramsar Strategic Plan 2016-2024. Uruguay.
- Schultz M, Tyrrell TD, Ebenhard T. 2016. The 2030 Agenda and Ecosystems - A discussion paper on the links between the Aichi Biodiversity Targets and the Sustainable Development Goals. SwedBio at Stockholm Resilience Centre, Stockholm, Sweden.
- Secretariat of the Convention on Biological Diversity. 2010. Global Biodiversity Outlook 3. Montréal, Canada.
- UNEP World Conservation Monitoring Centre. 2012. Promoting synergies within the cluster of biodiversity-related multilateral environmental agreements. UNEP World Conservation Monitoring Centre, Cambridge, UK.
- UNEP World Conservation Monitoring Centre. 2015. Mapping Multilateral Environmental Agreements to the Aichi Biodiversity Targets. UNEP World Conservation Monitoring Centre, Cambridge, UK.
- United Nations Environment Programme. 2007. Guide for Negotiators of Multilateral Environmental Agreements. Programme UNE, Nairobi, Kenya.

United Nations Environment Programme. 2014. Development of the "MEA synergies" debate, with a particular focus on the biodiversity-related conventions and the International Environmental Governance (IEG) reform process. United Nations Environment Programme, Nairobi, Kenya.

United Nations Environment Programme. 2015. Sourcebook of opportunities for enhancing cooperation among the Biodiversity-related Conventions at national and regional levels. United Nations Environment Programme, Nairobi, Kenya.

United Nations Environment Programme and Convention on Biological Diversity. 2018. Overview of initiatives for enhancing coordination and collaboration at various levels across biodiversity-related conventions. Diversity UNEPaCoB, Cambridge, UK.

United Nations General Assembly. 2010. Resolution 65.161: Convention on Biological Diversity. New York, USA.

United Nations General Assembly. 2015. Resolution 70.1: Transforming our world: the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development New York, USA.

von Moltke K. 2001. On Clustering International Environmental Agreements. Development IIfS, Winnipeg, Canada.

Walpole M, et al. 2009. Tracking Progress Toward the 2010 Biodiversity Target and Beyond. *Science* **325**:1503-1504.


Table 1 Overview of the eight biodiversity related conventions, including their strategic plans.



	CBD*	CITES[¥]	CMS^ψ	Ramsar Convention[†]	WHC[‡]	ITPGRFA[#]	IPPC[€]	IWC[£]
Objective(s)	Conservation of biological diversity, sustainable use of its components and sharing of benefits	Ensuring that no species is subject to unsustainable exploitation because of international trade	Conservation of terrestrial, marine and avian migratory species through out their range	Ensuring the conservation and wise use of wetlands	Preservation of the cultural and natural heritage sites of outstanding universal value	Conservation and sustainable use of plant genetic resources for food and agriculture, and sharing of benefits	Protection of the world's cultivated and natural plant resources from plant pests	Conserve whales and manage whaling
Adoption	1992	1973	1979	1971	1972	2001	1951	1946
Entry into	1993	1975	1983	1975	1975	2004	1952	1948



force								
Website	https://www.cbdd.int/	https://cites.org/	http://www.cms.int/	http://www.ramsar.org/	http://whc.unesco.org/en/convention/	http://www.planttreaty.org/	https://www.ippc.int	https://iwc.int/home
Number of parties	196	183	126	169	193	144	183	87
Current strategic planning document	Strategic Plan for Biodiversity	CITES Strategic Vision	Strategic Plan for Migratory Species	The Ramsar Strategic Plan	Strategic Action Plan and Vision	No current strategic planning document**	IPPC Strategic Framework	-
Timeframe	2011-2020	2008-2020	2015-2023	2016-2024	2012-2022	-	2012-2019	-
Formal adoption	Decision X/2	Resolution 14.2	Resolution 11.2	Resolution XII.2	Resolution 18 GA 11	-	Adopted in March 2012	-
Inclusion of strategic objectives/goals/targets	4 goals and 20 Aichi Biodiversity Targets	3 goals and 16 objectives	5 goals and 16 objectives	4 goals and 16 targets	6 goals	-	4 strategic objectives and organizational results	-
Mapping of targets against the Aichi targets	<i>Not applicable</i>	Notification to the Parties No. 2015/032; Annex 3	Annex A of the Strategic Plan	Annex II of the Strategic Plan	No	-	No	-



*: Convention on Biological Diversity, †: the Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species of Wild Fauna and Flora, ‡: the Convention on the Conservation of Migratory Species of Wild Animals, §: the Ramsar Convention on Wetlands, ¶: the Convention concerning the Protection of the World Cultural and Natural Heritage, #: the International Treaty for Plant Genetic Resources for Food and Agriculture, €: the International Plant Protection Convention, and £: the International Convention for the Regulation of Whaling that established the International Whaling Commission. **In October 2015 the Governing Body (GB) of the ITPGRFA agreed to review the implementation of the Strategic Plan for the Implementation of the Benefit-sharing Fund of the Funding Strategy 2009-2013, and update it, including the development of a funding target for the Benefit-sharing Fund for the 2018-2023 period (Resolution 2/2015 (IT/GB-6/15/Res 2). Furthermore, In resolution 13/2015 (IT/GB-6/15/Res 13), the GB requests the Secretary to develop: with inputs from parties, a Multi-year Programme of Work for 2018-2025 for consideration at the next session of the GB; and a document outlining expected outcomes, outputs and milestones for the implementation of the Treaty in the 2016-2017 biennium




Table 2. Mapping the 20 Aichi Biodiversity Targets of the Global Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020 to the strategic plans of CITES (Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species of Wild Fauna and Flora 2016), CMS (Convention on Migratory Species 2014) and the Ramsar Convention (Ramsar Convention on Wetlands 2015b).



Global strategic plan for biodiversity 2011-2020	Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species of Wild Fauna and Flora (CITES)	Convention on the Conservation of Migratory Species of Wild Animals (CMS)	Convention on Wetlands (Ramsar)
 <p>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.</p>	<p>Objective 1.4 The Appendices correctly reflect the conservation needs of species.</p> <p>Objective 1.8 Parties and the Secretariat have adequate capacity building programmes in place.</p> <p>Objective 2.2 Sufficient resources are secured at the national/international levels to ensure compliance with and implementation and enforcement of the Convention.</p> <p>Objective 3.2 Awareness of the role and purpose of CITES is increased globally.</p> <p>Objective 3.3 Cooperation with relevant international environmental, trade and development organizations is enhanced.</p> <p>Objective 3.4 The contribution of CITES to the relevant Millennium Development Goals and sustainable development goals set at WSSD is strengthened by ensuring that international trade in wild fauna and flora is conducted at sustainable levels.</p>	<p>Target 1: People are aware of the multiple values of migratory species and their habitats and migratory systems, and the steps they can take to conserve them and ensure the sustainability of any use.</p>	<p>Target 11: Wetland functions, services and benefits are widely demonstrated, documented and disseminated.</p> <p>Target 16: Wetlands conservation and wise use are mainstreamed through communication, capacity development, education, participation and awareness.</p> <p>Target 19: Capacity building for implementation of the Convention and the 4th Ramsar Strategic Plan 2016 – 2024 is enhanced.</p>



 <p>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.</p>	<p>Objective 1.1 Parties comply with their obligations under the Convention through appropriate policies, legislation and procedures.</p> <p>Objective 1.5 Best available scientific information is the basis for non-detriment findings.</p> <p>Objective 3.1 Cooperation between CITES and international financial mechanisms and other related institutions is enhanced in order to support CITES-related conservation and sustainable development projects, without diminishing funding for currently prioritized activities.</p> <p>Objective 3.3 see first mention: Aichi target 1</p> <p>Objective 3.4 see first mention: Aichi target 1</p> <p>Objective 3.5 Parties and the Secretariat cooperate with other relevant international organizations and agreements dealing with natural resources, as appropriate, in order to achieve a coherent and collaborative approach to species which can be endangered by unsustainable trade, including those which are commercially exploited.</p>	<p>Target 2: Multiple values of migratory species and their habitats have been integrated into international, national, and local development and poverty reduction strategies and planning processes, and are being incorporated into national accounting, as appropriate, and reporting systems.</p>	<p>Target 1: Wetlands benefits are features in national/ local policy strategies and plans relating to key sectors such as water, energy, mining, agriculture, tourism, urban development, infrastructure, industry, forestry, aquaculture, fisheries at the national and local level</p> <p>Target 11 see first mention: Aichi target 1</p>
 <p>By 2020, at the latest, incentives, including subsidies, harmful to</p>	<p>Objective 1.1 see first mention: Aichi target 2</p> <p>Objective 1.2 Parties have in place administrative procedures that are transparent, practical, coherent and user-friendly, and reduce unnecessary</p>	<p>Target 4: Incentives, including subsidies, harmful to migratory species, and/or their habitats are eliminated, phased out or reformed in order to minimize or avoid negative impacts, and positive incentives for the conservation of migratory species and their habitats</p>	<p>Target 3: The public and private sectors have increased their efforts to apply guidelines and good practices for the wise use of water and wetlands.</p>




<p>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 socio economic conditions.</p>	<p>administrative burden. Objective 2.2 see first mention: Aichi target 1 Objective 3.3 see first mention: Aichi target 1 Objective 3.4 see first mention: Aichi target 1</p>	<p>are developed and applied, consistent with engagements under the CMS and other relevant international obligations and commitments.</p>	
 <p>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.</p>	<p>Objective 1.1 see first mention: Aichi target 2 Objective 1.5 see first mention: Aichi target 2 Objective 1.6 Parties cooperate in managing shared wildlife resources. Objective 1.7 Parties are enforcing the Convention to reduce illegal wildlife trade. Objective 3.2 see first mention: Aichi target 1 Objective 3.3 see first mention: Aichi target 1 Objective 3.4 see first mention: Aichi target 1 Objective 3.5 see first mention: Aichi target 2</p>	<p>Target 5: Governments, key sectors and stakeholders at all levels have taken steps to achieve or have implemented plans for sustainable production and consumption, keeping the impacts of natural resource use on migratory species well within safe ecological limits to promote the favourable conservation status of migratory species and maintain the quality, integrity, resilience, and connectivity of their habitats and migratory routes.</p>	<p>Target 3 see first mention: Aichi target 3 Target 9: The wise use of wetlands is strengthened through integrated resource management at the appropriate scale, inter alia, within a river basin or along a coastal zone.</p>
 <p>By 2020, the rate of loss of all natural habitats, including forests, is at least halved and where feasible brought</p>	<p>Objective 1.5 see first mention: Aichi target 2 Objective 1.6 see first mention: Aichi target 4 Objective 1.7 see first mention: Aichi target 4 Objective 3.4 see first mention: Aichi target 1 Objective 3.5 see first mention: Aichi target 2</p>	<p>Target 10: All key habitats and sites for migratory species are identified and included in area-based conservation measures so as to maintain their quality, integrity, resilience and functioning in accordance with the implementation of Aichi Target 11.</p>	<p>Goal 1: Addressing the drivers of wetland and degradation Target 7: Sites that are at risk of change of ecological character have threats addressed.</p>



<p>close to zero, and degradation and fragmentation is significantly reduced.</p>			
 <p>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.</p>	<p>Objective 1.1 see first mention: Aichi target 2 Objective 1.4 see first mention: Aichi target 1 Objective 1.5 see first mention: Aichi target 2 Objective 1.6 see first mention: Aichi target 4 Objective 1.7 see first mention: Aichi target 4 Objective 3.4 see first mention: Aichi target 1 Objective 3.5 see first mention: Aichi target 2</p>	<p>Target 6: Fisheries and hunting have no significant direct or indirect adverse impacts on migratory species, their habitats or their migration routes, and impacts of fisheries and hunting are within safe ecological limits.</p>	<p>Target 5: The ecological character of Ramsar sites is maintained or restored, through effective planning and integrated management. Target 9 see first mention: Aichi target 4 Target 13: Enhanced sustainability of key sectors such as water, energy, mining, agriculture, tourism, urban development, infrastructure, industry, forestry, aquaculture and fisheries fisheries, agriculture and ecotourism practices when they affect wetlands, contributing to biodiversity conservation and human livelihoods.</p>
 <p>By 2020 areas under agriculture, aquaculture and forestry are managed sustainably, ensuring conservation of biodiversity.</p>	<p>Objective 1.5 see first mention: Aichi target 2 Objective 1.6 see first mention: Aichi target 4 Objective 1.7 see first mention: Aichi target 4 Objective 3.4 see first mention: Aichi target 1 Objective 3.5 see first mention: Aichi target 2</p>	<p>Target 5: Governments, key sectors and stakeholders at all levels have taken steps to achieve or have implemented plans for sustainable production and consumption, keeping the impacts of natural resource use on migratory species well within safe ecological limits to promote the favourable conservation status of migratory species and maintain the quality, integrity, resilience, and connectivity of their habitats and migratory routes.</p>	<p>Target 2: Water use respects wetland ecosystem needs for them to fulfil their functions and provide services at the appropriate scale inter alia at the basin level or along a coastal zone. Target 3 see first mention: Aichi target 3 Target 7 see first mention: Aichi target 5 Target 9 see first mention: Aichi target 4 Target 13 see first mention: Aichi target 6</p>


 <p>By 2020, pollution, including from excess nutrients, has been brought to levels that are not detrimental to ecosystem function and biodiversity.</p>	<p>No equivalent objective</p>	<p>Target 7: Multiple anthropogenic pressures have been brought to levels that are not detrimental to the conservation of migratory species or to the functioning, integrity, ecological connectivity and resilience of their habitats.</p>	<p>Target 2 see first mention: Aichi target 7 Target 3 see first mention: Aichi target 3</p>
 <p>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.</p>	<p>Objective 1.1 see first mention: Aichi target 2 Objective 1.3 Implementation of the Convention at the national level is consistent with decisions adopted by the Conference of the Parties. Objective 1.5 see first mention: Aichi target 2 Objective 1.7 see first mention: Aichi target 4 Objective 3.3 see first mention: Aichi target 1</p>	<p>Target 7: Multiple anthropogenic pressures have been brought to levels that are not detrimental to the conservation of migratory species or to the functioning, integrity, ecological connectivity and resilience of their habitats.</p>	<p>Target 4: Invasive alien species and pathways of introduction and expansion are identified and prioritized, priority invasive alien species are controlled or eradicated, and management responses are prepared and implemented to prevent their introduction and establishment.</p>
 <p>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.</p>	<p>Objective 1.1 see first mention: Aichi target 2 Objective 1.4 see first mention: Aichi target 1 Objective 1.5 see first mention: Aichi target 2 Objective 1.6 see first mention: Aichi target 4 Objective 1.7 see first mention: Aichi target 4 Objective 3.4 see first mention: Aichi target 1 Objective 3.5 see first mention: Aichi target 2</p>	<p>Target 7: Multiple anthropogenic pressures have been brought to levels that are not detrimental to the conservation of migratory species or to the functioning, integrity, ecological connectivity and resilience of their habitats.</p>	<p>Target 6 There is a significant increase in area, numbers and ecological connectivity in the Ramsar Site network in particular underrepresented types of wetlands including in underrepresented ecoregions and transboundary sites</p>

 <p>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.</p>	<p>Objective 1.4 see first mention: Aichi target 1</p> <p>Objective 3.5 see first mention: Aichi target 2</p>	<p>Target 10: All key habitats and sites for migratory species are identified and included in area-based conservation measures so as to maintain their quality, integrity, resilience and functioning in accordance with the implementation of Aichi Target 11.</p>	<p>Goal 2: Effectively conserving and managing the Ramsar Site network</p> <p>Target 5 see first mention: Aichi target 6</p> <p>Target 6: see first mention Aichi Target 11</p> <p>Target 7 see first mention: Aichi target 5</p>
 <p>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.</p>	<p>Objective 1.1 see first mention: Aichi target 2</p> <p>Objective 1.4 see first mention: Aichi target 1</p> <p>Objective 1.5 see first mention: Aichi target 2</p> <p>Objective 1.6 see first mention: Aichi target 4</p> <p>Objective 1.7 see first mention: Aichi target 4</p> <p>Objective 1.8 see first mention: Aichi target 1</p> <p>Objective 2.2 see first mention: Aichi target 1</p> <p>Objective 2.3 Sufficient resources are secured at the national/international levels to implement</p>	<p>Target 8: The conservation status of threatened migratory species has considerably improved throughout their range.</p>	<p>Target 5 see first mention: Aichi target 6</p> <p>Target 7: see first mention: Aichi target 5</p> <p>Target 8: National wetland inventories have been either initiated, completed or updated and disseminated and used for promoting the conservation and effective management of all wetlands.</p>

	<p>capacity-building programmes.</p> <p>Objective 3.2 see first mention: Aichi target 1</p> <p>Objective 3.3 see first mention: Aichi target 1</p> <p>Objective 3.4 see first mention: Aichi target 1</p> <p>Objective 3.5 see first mention: Aichi target 2</p>		
 <p>By 2020, the genetic diversity of cultivated plants and farmed and domesticated animals and of wild relatives, including other socio-economically as well as culturally valuable species, is maintained, and strategies have been developed and implemented for minimizing genetic erosion and safeguarding their genetic diversity.</p>	<p>No equivalent objective</p>	<p>Target 12: The genetic diversity of wild populations of migratory species is safeguarded, and strategies have been developed and implemented for minimizing genetic erosion.</p>	<p>Target 11: Wetland functions, services and benefits are widely demonstrated, documented and disseminated.</p>
 <p>By 2020, ecosystems that provide essential 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</p>	<p>Objective 1.3 see first mention: Aichi target 9</p> <p>Objective 1.5 see first mention: Aichi target 2</p> <p>Objective 3.3 see first mention: Aichi target 1</p> <p>Objective 3.4 see first mention: Aichi target 1</p> <p>Objective 3.5 see first mention: Aichi target 2</p>	<p>Target 11: Migratory species and their habitats which provide important ecosystem services are maintained at or restored to favourable conservation status, taking into account the needs of women, indigenous and local communities, and the poor and vulnerable.</p>	<p>Target 8 see first mention: Aichi target 12</p> <p>Target 11 see first mention: Aichi target 1</p> <p>Target 12: Restoration is in progress in degraded wetlands, with priority to wetlands that are relevant for biodiversity conservation, disaster risk reduction, livelihoods and/or climate change mitigation and adaptation</p>

vulnerable.			
 <p>By 2020, ecosystem resilience and the contribution of biodiversity to carbon stocks has 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.</p>	No equivalent objective	<p>Target 11: Migratory species and their habitats which provide important ecosystem services are maintained at or restored to favourable conservation status, taking into account the needs of women, indigenous and local communities, and the poor and vulnerable.</p>	<p>Target 12 see first mention: Aichi target 14</p>
 <p>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.</p>	<p>Objective 1.1 see first mention: Aichi target 2</p>	No equivalent target	No equivalent target
 <p>By 2015 each Party has developed, adopted as a policy instrument, and has commenced implementing an effective,</p>	<p>Objective 3.4 see first mention: Aichi target 1</p>	<p>Target 13: Priorities for effective management and conservation of migratory species and migratory systems have been included in the development and implementation of national biodiversity strategies and action plans, where relevant, with reference to regional CMS agreements and action plans and their</p>	<p>Target 19 see first mention: Aichi target 1</p>

<p>participatory and updated national biodiversity strategy and action plan.</p>		<p>regional implementation bodies.</p>	
 <p>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.</p>	<p>Objective 1.1 see first mention: Aichi target 2</p> <p>Objective 1.3 see first mention: Aichi target 9</p> <p>Objective 1.5 see first mention: Aichi target 2</p> <p>Objective 3.2 see first mention: Aichi target 1</p> <p>Objective 3.4 see first mention: Aichi target 1</p>	<p>Target 14: The traditional knowledge, innovations and practices of indigenous and local communities relevant for the conservation and sustainable use of migratory species, their habitats and migratory systems, and their customary sustainable use of biological resources, are respected, subject to national legislation and relevant international obligations, with the full and effective participation of indigenous and local communities, thereby contributing to the favourable conservation status of migratory species and the ecological connectivity and resilience of their habitats.</p>	<p>Target 8 see first mention: Aichi target 12</p> <p>Target 10: The traditional knowledge, innovations and practices of indigenous peoples and local communities relevant for the wise use of wetlands and their customary use of wetland resources, are documented, respected, subject to national legislation and relevant international obligations and fully integrated and reflected in the implementation of the Convention with a full and effective participation of indigenous and local communities at all relevant levels.</p> <p>Target 16 see first mention: Aichi target 1</p>
 <p>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</p>	<p>Objective 1.4 see first mention: Aichi target 1</p> <p>Objective 1.5 see first mention: Aichi target 2</p> <p>Objective 1.6 see first mention: Aichi target 4</p> <p>Objective 1.8 see first mention: Aichi target 1</p> <p>Objective 2.2 see first mention: Aichi target 1</p> <p>Objective 2.3 see first mention: Aichi target 12</p> <p>Objective 3.3 see first mention: Aichi target</p>	<p>Target 15: The science base, information, awareness, understanding and technologies relating to migratory species, their habitats and migratory systems, their value, functioning, status and trends, and the consequences of their loss, are improved, widely shared and transferred, and effectively applied.</p>	<p>Target 8 see first mention: Aichi target 12</p> <p>Target 14: Scientific and technical guidance at global and regional levels is developed on relevant topics and is available to policy makers and practitioners in an appropriate format and language</p>

applied.	1 Objective 3.4 see first mention: Aichi target 1 Objective 3.5 see first mention: Aichi target 2		
 <p>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.</p>	<p>Objective 2.1 Financial resources are sufficient to ensure operation of the Convention.</p> <p>Objective 2.2 see first mention: Aichi target 1</p> <p>Objective 2.3 see first mention: Aichi target 12</p> <p>Objective 3.1 see first mention: Aichi target 2</p>	<p>Target 16: The mobilization of adequate resources from all sources to effectively implement the Strategic Plan for Migratory Species has increased substantially.</p>	<p>Target 17: Financial and other resources for effectively implementing the fourth Ramsar Strategic Plan 2016 – 2024 from all sources are made available</p>

The specific text is directly sourced from the individual convention's Strategic Plans. Where objectives and targets from CITES, CMS, or the Ramsar Convention apply to multiple Aichi Targets, the text is only written in full for the first match.