**THE REPUBLIC OF KOREA’S VIEW**

**ON THE POST-2020 GLOBAL BIODIVERSITY FRAMEWORK**

In response to CBD Notification 2019-008, the Republic of Korea would like to provide its current view on the aspects of the scope and content of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework. The Republic of Korea will collect and reflect further considerations and comments from different sectors, and looks forward to witnessing progress to be made during future related sessions such as the open-ended working group meeting on this subject. The Republic of Korea sees the development of the post-2020 biodiversity framework as an agenda of great importance and is dedicated to contribute to relevant global discussions.

**1. STRUCTURE**

The current biodiversity strategy presents a flat structure with 20 targets described separately. In order to enhance the loose connectivity between the strategy, goals, targets and indicators of the next biodiversity framework, a hierarchical structure could be a good solution. Furthermore, the establishment of long-term goals reflecting the 2050 vision is essential to achieve the vision consistently and enhance the correlation between the new framework and 2050 vision. The Republic of Korea views that such a structure will enable more effective promotion of the framework and public awareness.

Also, the language used in the new targets will need to be precise, concise and simple to avoid difficulties in communication, which was also emphasized at the regional consultation meeting for Asia and the Pacific held in February 2019.

**2. AMBITION**

The goals of the framework should be challenging enough to trigger effective and appropriate actions at various levels. However, the level of ambition will need to be carefully set depending on each target, as excessively ambitious or unrealistic goals could discourage implementors.

**3. SCOPE**

The key to expansion of the scope of the framework and facilitation of transformative changes to achieve the 2050 vision is effective participation of local governments, businesses and stakeholders from various sectors including agriculture, fisheries and forestry. In order for the next framework to ensure this, the following could be considered:

- A target to present/develop a model that enables coexistence and harmony of development and conservation

- A process and a legal basis that allow local governments to develop and review implementation of local biodiversity strategy

- Details of roles, participation and responsibilities of industries for biodiversity conservation

- Emphasis of urban biodiversity and local biodiversity in regard to the trend of increasing urban areas globally

- Strategy that promotes achievement of both conservation and wise use in agricultural, fishery and forestry sectors

**4. TARGETS**

Targets should be practical and specific for better implementation in each country, be SMART (specific, measurable, ambitious, realistic and time-bound), as appropriate, and maintain balance between ‘pressure’, ‘state’ and ‘response’ indicators as appropriate.

**A. Continuity from Aichi Target:**

The post-2020 global biodiversity framework will need to investigate what was not achieved in Aichi Targets and contribute to implementation of such targets in different approaches. Targets that are achieved or mostly achieved could also present more ambitious aim to promote more effective conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity at the global scale. For instance, Target 11 (protected area coverage) is relatively better achieved than other targets. However, more effective efforts could be made to manage key biodiversity areas in critical conditions if the emphasis is also put on evaluating ‘state’ and addressing ‘pressure’, rather than solely on ‘response’ as in the current Aichi Target 11. Protected area-related targets can also include or be linked with targets on habitat management and restoration and securing habitat connectivity.

**B. Link with Sustainable Development Goals**

While it is important to keep the post-2020 framework in line with the SDGs, targets should include all three main objectives of the Convention, taking into account its unique functions and services.

**C. Consideration of Capacity Gap among Parties**

There is a significant gap among Parties in awareness, technology, legislation and institutionalization, and mainstreaming to achieve the three objectives of the Convention. Such a gap can and should be reduced through technology transfer and capacity building. This aspect should be adequately taken into consideration in the post-2020 framework so as to promote active and effective cooperation of Parties.

**5. INDICATORS**

Indicators could play a pivotal role in assessing target achievement progress globally and nationally, and therefore it is important to develop and select appropriate indicators for each target, just as the current Target 11 having a clear indicator, for more efficient implementation in each Party.

Furthermore, if there is a lack of data or a technical gap among Parties, indicators on assessing the ‘state’ could be complementary as the first step towards such targets. For example, assessing achievement progress and result of relevant policies for Aichi Target 13 on genetic diversity was difficult since appropriate scientific data had not been accumulated enough in many Parties before and after related actions. This challenge could be overcome if the target has one or more ‘state’ indicators on genetic diversity of endangered and important species, enabling gradual accumulation of technology and data and target achievement at the same time.

**6. MAINSTREAMING**

Biodiversity mainstreaming is a core element in achieving the 2050 vision and can be catalyzed by increased awareness of policy makers and the public. The post-2020 framework will provide goals and strategy for the next decade as well as guidance on actions to be taken by policy makers and stakeholders, contribute to mainstreaming biodiversity and help promote communication and participation on biodiversity conservation.

However, as mainstreaming could work differently for different sectors, mainstreaming biodiversity should not be covered in a single target but rather a goal embracing multiple targets on mainstreaming.

**7. IMPLEMENTATION AND NATIONAL BIODIVERSITY STRATEGY AND ACTION PLAN**

In case of the current biodiversity strategy, targets were selected first and relevant indicators came later. This gap resulted in difficult situations for Parties when working on the sixth national report where achievement progress and implementation efficiency could not be assessed due to lack of data for the period before the indicators were finalized. Also gap in data and technology among Parties made it difficult to assess achievement progress in each Party on the same criteria.

The post-2020 framework should develop indicators at the same time as finalization of targets, taking into account insufficient data and technology gap and utilizing indicators already developed (BIP, for example) if necessary. This will prevent lack of data during achievement progress assessment and strengthen national implementation of the framework.