

The Global Partnership for Plant Conservation

POST-2020 GLOBAL BIODIVERSITY FRAMEWORK: DISCUSSION PAPER a submission from the Global Partnership for Plant Conservation

12th April, 2019

The following is a response provided to the Executive Secretary of the Convention on Biological Diversity (SCBD) on the Issues and Questions for Discussion included in the document 'POST-2020 GLOBAL BIODIVERSITY FRAMEWORK: DISCUSSION PAPER' (CBD/POST2020/PREP/1/1, 25 January 2019) in relation to Preparations for the Post-2020 Biodiversity Framework.

The submission is provided by the Global Partnership for Plant Conservation (GPPC) and incorporates responses to the questions provided by many members of the partnership.

IV. ISSUES AND QUESTIONS FOR DISCUSSION

10. Based on previous decision and submissions from Parties and observers, a number of issue areas are identified below. Some questions to stimulate further discussion are also provided.

A. Structure of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework

11. Many submissions suggested that a structure or approach is needed to link the different elements of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework and to highlight the linkages between its different elements. In the submissions, several different possible models or approaches were proposed. Some of the suggested approaches have been a pyramid or tiered structure while others have suggested structures similar to the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development and the current Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020.

Question: What could constitute an effective structure for the post-2020 global biodiversity framework, what should its different elements be, and how should they be organized?

Answer:

The Global Partnership for Plant Conservation (GPPC) suggests that an action-orientated framework based on a refined and updated series of global targets (modeled on the existing Aichi Targets) can be the most effective structure for the post-2020 global biodiversity framework.

The organization of a series of elements might well be achieved by grouping specific and related targets under a series of objectives, in a similar way to the use of Strategic Goals in the current Strategic Plan for Biodiversity (SPD). The Global Strategy for Plant Conservation currently has a series of such objectives which have provided a valuable high level organizational point of reference for national, regional and sectoral responses to that Strategy and this could also work well in the post-2020 biodiversity framework.

A notable absence from the issues currently addressed by the SPD Goals is the lack of any focus on the importance of the scientific base for conservation. Global collaborations and platforms that facilitate this are very valuable, such as the World Flora Online (an initiative of the Global Partnership for Plant Conservation and a worldwide consortium of botanical institutions aimed at achieving Target 1 of the Global Strategy for Plant Conservation by 2020).

Within the current Aichi target framework little emphasis on species-level conservation is included and this should be addressed.

It is also notable that there are gaps in the Aichi Targets, linked to addressing a particular driver of biodiversity loss – unsustainable and illegal use and trade of wildlife (encompassing flora and fauna, marine and terrestrial). Sustainable use of biodiversity is one of the three objectives of CBD, and illegal and unsustainable trade is one of the key drivers of biodiversity loss. Furthermore, sustainable, well-managed legal wildlife trade can provide benefits for biodiversity and ecosystem services. It is a notable absence from the existing Aichi Targets, which do not include a target specific to trade in wildlife. While certain other Multilateral Environmental Agreements—in particular the Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species of Wild Fauna and Flora (CITES) and the Convention on the Conservation of Migratory Species of Wild Animals (CMS)—address elements of wildlife trade, wider commitment to this aspect of conservation is needed, under the umbrella of the global biodiversity framework, including to provide the direct link to the implementation of the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development. The relevant areas of work in CBD include the Global Strategy for Plant Conservation, Sustainable Use of Biodiversity, Health and Biodiversity, and Business and Biodiversity, among others.

The framework adopted should also facilitate and encourage the development of thematic, regional or sectoral targets and processes, such as a post-2020 Global Strategy for Plant Conservation, that can contribute to any post-2020 targets adopted. Such thematic or sectoral responses are likely to include actions that could be developed and recognized as sub-targets or milestones that contribute to the post-2020 targets and are ‘nested’ within it. Such linked and related responses will be important to promote and foster strong ownership and support for implementation of the post-2020 framework throughout very broad international and national communities.

Following a request from a recent Liaison Group meeting for the Global Strategy for Plant Conservation (GSPC) held in Cape Town, South Africa in September 2018¹, the GPPC has developed suggestions for a possible post-2020 GSPC, including Aichi target related plant conservation actions, updating both the existing 2010-2020 GSPC targets and linking them more specifically with the Aichi targets and to the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs). Such new post-2020 GSPC targets can be nested within and recognized as sub-targets for the post-2020 global biodiversity framework and play

¹ <https://www.cbd.int/doc/c/cb54/dbd6/b7dd584f9bd2deb654a5f4cb/gspclg-06-02-en.pdf>

an important part in its achievement. The draft discussion structure for updated and enhanced GSPC targets is available from the Global Partnership for Plant Conservation and aims to include SMART targets and means for their measurement in all areas of the Strategy. This framework will continue to evolve and be updated as the form and detail of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework takes shape and is more precisely defined.

The GPPC hopes that this table of proposed post-2020 GSPC targets can be considered as a contribution towards the discussions on the developing post-2020 framework.

B. Ambition of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework

12. A general view is that the post-2020 global biodiversity framework should be ambitious and support the transformational changes needed to realize the 2050 Vision for Biodiversity. The post-2020 global biodiversity framework should serve as a universal framework for action on biodiversity and foster strong ownership and support for its implementation.

Question: In the context of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework, what would “ambitious” specifically mean?

Answer:

Ambition should relate to the achievement of precise outcomes for the conservation and recovery of biodiversity and the restoration of ecosystems, measured by the adoption of specific targets and the ongoing review of progress over time towards their achievement. Ideally ‘ambitious’ would also incorporate an iconic global target to help galvanize the global community. For example, an ambitious target for the formal protection of terrestrial and marine ecosystems would send a powerful message, and would greatly assist with the achievement of a range of other Aichi targets.

We urge the adoption of ambitious ‘stretch’ targets which go beyond developments that might be expected to be achieved under existing processes and initiatives. Ambitious objectives should include measures put in place to ensure that biodiversity conservation in the post-2020 period extends beyond the traditional biodiversity community into related areas such as implementation of many of the Sustainable Development Goals.

C. 2050 Vision for Biodiversity

13. Decision 14/2, sets out that the 2050 Vision “Living in harmony with nature” remains relevant and should be considered in the post-2020 global biodiversity framework. Further many submissions also indicated that the rationale for the 2050 Vision should be further developed and that a common and clear understanding of what reaching the 2050 Vision for Biodiversity entails in concrete terms needs to be developed.

Question: What, in real terms, does “living in harmony” with nature entail, what are the implications of this for the scope and content of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework and what actions are needed between now and 2050 to reach the 2050 Vision?

Answer:

In the context of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework, “living in harmony” with nature should be a continued reminder of the need for our human species to achieve the fundamental objectives of the Convention on Biological Diversity, integrating biodiversity conservation with sustainable use and equity. The achievement of the objectives of a post-2020 global biodiversity framework should be clearly identifiable as the attainment of a part of a 2050 goal. Living in harmony with nature also means living within the world’s ecological limits and so the post-2020 global biodiversity framework and other longer term actions that form part of a response to the 2050 goal must take into account steps necessary to address the impact of growing human populations in many parts of the world and how to manage biodiversity alongside preventing and reversing climate change. Biodiverse ecosystems provide considerably more resilience to sustain human life and have greater ability to survive major threat events than degraded ecosystems.

D. Mission

14. Decision 14/34 specifies that the post-2020 framework should be accompanied by an inspirational and motivating 2030 mission as a stepping stone towards the 2050 Vision “Living in harmony with nature”, and that it should be supported by a coherent, comprehensive and innovative communication strategy. The need for a clear definition of what the mission statement means in practice was noted in many submissions and different suggestions for its formulation have been submitted.

Question: What would be the elements and content of an actionable 2030 mission statement for the post-2020 global biodiversity framework?

Answer:

It will be important to have a short and descriptive mission statement for the post-2020 global biodiversity framework, which promotes communication of action-orientated understanding, awareness and involvement in the achievement of the framework at all levels. Encapsulating in the mission statement the importance of biodiversity for human society and wellbeing and to sustain ourselves and other species on the planet will be essential too. Since efforts up to now have failed to reduce the rate of biodiversity loss, let alone reverse biodiversity’s decline, a clear focus on biodiversity conservation and real achievements projected for 2030 must be captured in such a mission statement.

E. Biodiversity Targets

15. There is wide support for the post-2020 global biodiversity framework having a set of science-and knowledge-based “SMART” (specific, measurable, ambitious, realistic and time-bound) biodiversity

targets for the period from 2021 to 2030. Several submissions noted that the Aichi Biodiversity Targets should be used as the basis for developing any new targets and that changes to these should be kept to a minimum. Alternatively, it was suggested that some “modernization” of the Aichi Targets might be required. Further, many submissions suggested possible new targets.

Questions:

(a) What does “SMART” targets mean in practical terms?

Answer:

Having SMART targets will greatly facilitate the measurement of progress towards the achievement of general and specific biodiversity conservation objectives. To be ‘SMART’, targets should relate to biodiversity conservation outcomes in general and specifically whenever possible, rather than to processes involved in specific conservation tasks (these might instead be considered as ‘milestones’ along the way towards the desired outcome). The production of new scientific data is generally required to support the measurement of most SMART targets.

With the exception of Target 11, none of the existing Aichi targets are currently ‘SMART’ and so a primary task for the development of a post-2020 framework should be updating and refining these targets to make them measurable. It is notable that the achievement of Target 11 has probably been the most successful of all the Aichi targets.

In some cases, the definition of ‘SMART’ targets for some aspects of biodiversity conservation is not easy (such as in measuring awareness, or the conservation of traditional knowledge of biodiversity). In these cases, the development of ‘SMART’ sub-targets for aspects on the achievement of the broader target itself could help. This would clearly be possible with the development of a post-2020 GSPC where some parts of the botanical and plant science community have very effective SMART targets and processes in place to measure them.

In evaluating the potential of a target-based approach to the post-2020 global biodiversity framework it will be valuable to assess what has made for a good target up to 2020. This could be done through the examination of targets that were set at national levels by various Parties and through understanding the drivers of progress towards the existing Aichi targets and those of the GSPC. It is also important to understand what ‘success’ looked like and what measures were put in place in response to the targets and what were their impact. Understanding why some targets have been missed and what were the reasons (such as that they were too ambitious, or because of a lack of capacity or resources) will help the process towards the formulation of good post 2020 targets.

(b) How should the set of targets in the post-2020 global biodiversity framework relate to existing Aichi Biodiversity Targets?

Answer:

The set of targets in the post-2020 global biodiversity framework should be clearly related to existing Aichi Biodiversity Targets, i) updated and refined to reflect progress already achieved, ii) to highlight

new, urgent or emerging conservation action required, iii) to ensure that such post-2020 targets are ‘SMART’ and iv) to link them more to the biodiversity frameworks of other sectors (such as the SDGs and other biodiversity related conventions), thematic areas (such as the GSPC), and regional initiatives.

In the existing Aichi Targets there is a notable lack of species-focused targets, as well as targets related to developing the scientific base for conservation. These concerns could perhaps be addressed with the agreement of clearly articulated and globally agreed sub-targets. Such sub-targets could in some cases be directed to particular stakeholder communities (such as all those involved in the implementation of the Global Strategy for Plant Conservation).

(c) How should the set of targets in the post-2020 global biodiversity framework align with other global targets, including those adopted under the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development?

Answer:

Mapping existing Aichi targets against the objectives of other global targets related to biodiversity and sustainable development will help to identify the ways in which post-2020 targets can help link with and address such targets, as well as help to ensure that achievement in these other areas can contribute to (and be seen to contribute to) the post-2020 framework and its targets, and vice versa.

An example of a Sustainable Development Goal (SDG), which is not reflected in the current Aichi Targets is one concerning the commitments to addressing the sustainable use of natural resources and to tackling one of the main drivers of biodiversity decline – unsustainable and illegal trade in flora and fauna. This is covered in SDG 15.7: “*Take urgent action to end poaching and trafficking of protected species of flora and fauna, and address both demand and supply of illegal wildlife products*”. Establishing a target within the post-2020 global biodiversity framework, which focuses on wildlife trade, is essential to ensure the political commitment and levels of implementation to address this truly global issue. It will also ensure connectivity with the SDGs, essential when addressing this key topic.

However, it is extremely important that the focus of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework does not shift away from biodiversity conservation to other sustainable development issues. In addition, it is essential to ensure that implementing any of the individual SDGs does not compromise biodiversity values.

F. Voluntary commitments and contributions

16. Decision 14/34 invites Parties and other Governments to consider developing biodiversity commitments which contribute to an effective post-2020 global biodiversity framework and encourages indigenous peoples and local communities and all relevant organizations and stakeholders, including the private sector, to contribute to the Sharm El-Sheikh to Beijing Action Agenda for Nature and People. Several submissions also commented on the desirability of voluntary commitments. However, others felt that voluntary commitments, while providing useful impetus, may not directly lead the global community to scientifically supported goals and outcomes.

Question: What form should voluntary commitments for biodiversity take and how should these relate to or be reflected in the post-2020 global biodiversity framework?

Answer:

Voluntary commitments made by many relevant organizations and stakeholders, including the private sector, are fundamental to the achievement of the objectives of the post-2020 framework. Indeed, without such voluntary commitments the GPPC believes that it is unlikely that many of the targets will be attained. Therefore, the framework must provide easily accessible entry points for such voluntary contributions and recognition of the importance of such contributions for the post-2020 process.

The development and recognition of effective partnerships can play a valuable role in linking voluntary contributions towards the post-2020 global biodiversity framework. The Global Partnership for Plant Conservation is an excellent and major example of such voluntary contributions to a CBD initiative in the period up to 2020 through its support of the CBD's Global Strategy for Plant Conservation.

Closer definition of the great diversity of forms of voluntary contributions for biodiversity conservation would be helpful, which can take the form of, for example, financial support, in-kind contributions, capacity building, awareness raising, development and implementation of 'biodiversity friendly' policies and actions by related sectors (such as in the commercial and production sectors and the media) and other areas across society, including through citizen involvement. Examples of voluntary partnerships, such as the Global Partnership for Plant Conservation and the World Flora Online Consortium, have demonstrated the valuable contributions that such platforms and partnerships can make to achieving biodiversity objectives. These provide one model of how voluntary contributions that can contribute to the post-2020 global biodiversity framework.

There is certainly an urgent need for countries, the international community and many other stakeholders to increase their investment in biodiversity conservation from the current levels if the post-2020 biodiversity conservation objectives are to be achieved. This would include seeking to align funding commitments from various national research and conservation bodies with the post-2020 objectives. Relying on voluntary contributions is not going to be sufficient to put in place the resources needed.

G. Relationship between the post-2020 global biodiversity framework and other relevant processes

17. Many submissions note that the post-2020 global biodiversity framework should be consistent with the commitments, frameworks, processes and plans established by the biodiversity related conventions and other multilateral environmental agreements. Similarly, the need for the post-2020 global biodiversity framework to be coherent with and supportive of the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development, the Paris Agreement, the other two Rio conventions, the other biodiversity-related conventions, and FAO processes among other were frequently noted. A general view expressed in several submissions is that the post-2020 global biodiversity framework should be used to reinforce synergies within the United Nations System.

Question: How could a post-2020 global biodiversity framework help to ensure coherence, integration and a holistic approach to biodiversity governance and what are the implications for the scope and content of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework?

Answer:

There is a need for measures and targets to be included in the post-2020 biodiversity in relation to effective biodiversity governance at all levels. This should specifically address the protection of biodiversity in protected areas and other important and notable sites that are rich in biodiversity which may not be currently included in any protected area systems, or which occurs in broader production or other landscapes. Such governance for biodiversity conservation will also be necessary in areas of national and local level governance that fall outside authorities that do not traditionally address biodiversity concerns (e.g. agriculture and development), so that biodiversity protection is increasingly integrated into wider national development and socio-economic planning processes. We also stress here the importance of taking into account the scientific evaluations carried out by the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) and the Intergovernmental Science-Policy Platform on Biodiversity and Ecosystem Services (IPBES) and the need for the two intergovernmental bodies to work closely together and with the CBD in a post-2020 global biodiversity framework.

H. Mainstreaming

18. Decision 14/3 recognized that mainstreaming is critical for achieving the objectives of the Convention, the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020, its Aichi Biodiversity Targets and the 2050 Vision for Biodiversity and should be one of the key elements of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework in order to achieve the transformational change required throughout society and economies, including changes in behaviour and decision-making at all levels. Further, in decisions 14/3 and XIII/3, several specific sectors were highlighted owing to their dependencies and impacts on biodiversity and areas for development of a long-term strategic approach to biodiversity mainstreaming were identified. Several submissions pointed to the need for the post-2020 global biodiversity framework to offer greater opportunities for the mainstreaming of biodiversity across society and to develop synergies with other processes. The need to have a post-2020 global biodiversity framework which generates buy-in from sectors that are reliant on, and have significant impact on, biodiversity was also noted in many submissions.

Question: How can the post-2020 global biodiversity framework incorporate or support the mainstreaming of biodiversity across society and economies at large?

Answer:

An essential role of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework in mainstreaming of biodiversity across society and economies at large will be in ensuring that effective entry points and reporting mechanisms are provided to the framework for the broadest possible range of stakeholders, both governmental and non-governmental, in all parts of civil society.

I. Relationship with the current Strategic Plan

19. Many submissions note that the post-2020 global biodiversity framework should build from the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020.

Question: What are the lessons learned from the implementation of the current Strategic Plan? And how can the transition from the current decade to the post-2020 framework avoid further delays in implementation and where should additional attention be focused?

Answer:

There are many lessons to be learnt from the implementation of the current Strategic Plan, notably these could be focused on what was successful and what were the drivers of this success, as well as understanding and aiming to address the areas where less progress has been made. Understanding the constraints on progress and reasons for failure will be equally important. Further investigation and study of areas where major achievements were made, such as in the implementation of the Global Strategy for Plant Conservation, may help to identify some good strategic approaches for the post-2020 framework.

It is clear that in some cases less progress has been made in the achievement of specific parts of the current Strategic Plan, and particular Aichi Targets when progress in measuring such targets was difficult to achieve, or where the complexity of the targets itself may have limited engagement with the issues it sought to address. This points to a need for simplicity and clarity in the formulation of post-2020 targets and increasing efforts to make them ‘SMART’. The experience in the achievement of Aichi Target 11, which is clearly a ‘SMART’ target is particularly notable in this regard.

K. Indicators

20. The importance of identifying indicators for the different elements of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework was noted in many submissions. Most suggested that the starting point for indicators should be the indicators developed for the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020 noted in decision XIII/28. The indicators used in the IPBES global assessment were also suggested. The need for indicators which could be used at the global and regional level was also noted.

Question: What indicators, in addition to those already identified in decision XIII/28, are needed to monitor progress in the implementation of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework at the national, regional and global scales?

Answer:

Indicators are certainly needed and the current set of indicators available already provides a useful way to monitor progress, although further plant-based indicators would also be available that could be usefully added to the list. However, if new post-2020 targets are adopted that are truly SMART, then they are self-indicating and should be used to provide the primary means to monitor progress at all levels.

L. Implementation and NBSAPs

21. Many submissions noted the need to emphasize implementation in the post-2020 global biodiversity framework. The continued relevance of the NBSAPs for implementing the Convention was emphasized; however, many submissions also noted that the NBSAP process needs to be strengthened and accountability enhanced. Further many submissions noted the need for additional mechanisms to support implementation.

Question: How can the effectiveness and implementation of the NBSAPs be strengthened, what additional mechanisms or tools, if any, are required to support implementation of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework and how should these be reflected in the framework?

Answer:

Developing further ways for institutions, organizations and communities operating beyond the governmental sector at all levels to contribute more effectively to the development and implementation of NBSAPs can help to ensure that biodiversity conservation actions set out in NBSAPs can be implemented by a broader network and achieve much greater cross-sectoral support. Capacity building initiatives to support NBSAP implementation will also be important.

M. Resource mobilization

22. Decision 14/22 affirms that resource mobilization will be an integral part of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework and decided to initiate preparations on this component at an early stage in the process of developing the framework, in full coherence and coordination with the overall process for the post-2020 framework. Further the decision also tasked an expert panel to undertake a number of activities, and to prepare reports, to contribute to the overall process for the post-2020 framework. The importance of resource mobilization, has also been underlined in many of the submissions.

Question: How should the post-2020 global biodiversity framework address resource mobilization and what implications does this have for the scope and content of the framework?

Answer:

The growing potential role of voluntary contributions in helping to mobilize and provide new resources for biodiversity conservation needs to be evaluated.

The allocation of resources for biodiversity conservation from governmental and other sources needs to be considered so that important initiatives being undertaken by non-governmental bodies and communities for biodiversity conservation can gain access to appropriate support. The inclusion of technology to assist biodiversity conservation at a broad scale should be considered.

N. Financial mechanisms

23. Decision 14/23 welcomes the successful conclusion of the seventh replenishment of the Global Environment Facility Trust Fund and expresses appreciation for the continuing financial support from Parties and Governments for carrying out the tasks under the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-

2020 in its remaining years, and for supporting the implementation of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework in its first two years.

Question: How can the Global Environment Facility support the timely provision of financial resources to assist eligible Parties in implementing the post-2020 global biodiversity framework?

Answer:

There is a pressing need to provide mechanisms for smaller and more rapid / timely support for biodiversity conservation initiatives and projects (including ones that support the development of scientific data and understanding of biodiversity conservation needs), particularly at international level and subnational/community levels and to reduce bureaucracy in applying for and receiving GEF support. In general, the mechanisms and procedures for ensuring targeted implementation of CBD work programmes and priorities are complex and involve long time frames. The result is that opportunities for rapid, competent conservation action are being missed, placing biodiversity at risk. Some regard the Global Environment Facility (GEF) as cumbersome and bureaucratic that, while suitable for building capacity in the long term, is not geared to rapid, pinpointed conservation action, for example to address specific biodiversity conservation needs, such as the conservation of individual species and understanding the threats they face. There are too few funders that support a species conservation focus (especially for plants) and an increasingly long list of plant species on the brink of extinction. Financial support from the non-governmental sector cannot fill the gap between what is provided by governments and the intergovernmental community and what is needed. A GEF small grants programme designed to support rapid, targeted conservation action would help to address the current shortfall, ideally open to all conservation practitioners – government organisations and NGOs – operating in eligible countries.

Similar constraints exist with funding for capacity building. Voluntary contributions made by Parties have played an important role here but they are patchy and don't always address CBD work programme priorities. The establishment of a voluntary fund could help to address this situation to which governments and others could contribute. Private sector funding sources for capacity building in biodiversity conservation are very limited.

O. Review process

24. The need for an effective and timely review process for the post-2020 global biodiversity framework was noted in many submissions. In this respect, the continued importance of the national reports and the clearing-house mechanism of the Convention were highlighted. However, the need for more effective, robust and accountable national reporting was also highlighted. In addition, many submissions suggested additional mechanisms for reviewing progress in implementation and for building accountability and transparency.

Question: What additional mechanisms, if any, are required to support the review of implementation of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework and how should these be integrated into the framework?

Answer:

The development of more standard reporting formats for Parties and other stakeholders for reviewing steps taken towards the achievement of post-2020 goals and targets would contribute greatly to enabling progress to be monitored more effectively.

In addition, the establishment of coordination mechanisms for the achievement of individual or groups of related post-2020 targets should be considered by the Convention and the Parties, to help with coordination of effort, resource mobilization, monitoring progress, and implementation at various levels. Such a flexible coordination mechanism has played an important part in the success of the Global Strategy for Plant Conservation, from 2002 to the present, involving the CBD Secretariat, liaison group meetings and inputs from the Parties and the GPPC.

P. Relationship between the Convention and the Protocols

25. Decision CP-9/7 provides that biosafety should be reflected in the post-2020 global biodiversity framework and sets out steps towards the preparation of the biosafety component of the post-2020 framework. The decision also sets out a process for developing a specific Implementation Plan for the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety as a follow-up to the Strategic Plan for the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety for the period 2011-2020.

Question: What are the issues associated with biosafety under the Convention and what are the implications for the post-2020 global biodiversity framework?

26. Access and benefit-sharing is one of the three objectives of the Convention. Decision 14/31 and decision NP-3/15 specify that issues related to access and benefit sharing and the Nagoya Protocol should be considered in the development of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework.

Question: What are the issues associated with access and benefit-sharing under the Convention and what are the implications for the post-2020 global biodiversity framework?

Answer:

Evaluation of the constraints or obstacles in the achievement of some aspects of biodiversity conservation that are related to, or have been put in place inadvertently by, the Nagoya Protocol or by Parties responding to access and benefit issues needs to be undertaken and addressed. In particular, the limits or constraints on cross-border scientific cooperation research and the exchange of germplasm for conservation purposes needs to be addressed. These constraints continue to have unintended and negative consequences for biodiversity conservation research. These issues need addressing urgently and we emphasize the importance of developing simplified access measures (NP A8a) for non-commercial research purposes, to encourage and facilitate activities that support the objectives of the CBD. Greater focus and visibility on non-monetary benefit sharing, including partnerships and capacity building can also make significant contributions to achieving the objectives of the Nagoya Protocol.

Q. Integrating diverse perspectives

27. Many submissions noted that the development and implementation of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework will require a “whole of society approach”. The need to have greater involvement of some specific groups was repeatedly emphasized in the submissions, including: (a) *Indigenous peoples and local communities: the Conference of the Parties to the Convention on Biological Diversity, in decision 14/34, requested the Ad Hoc Open-ended Working Group on Article 8(j) and Related Provisions to provide recommendations concerning the potential role of traditional knowledge, customary sustainable use and the contribution of the collective actions of indigenous peoples and local communities to the post-2020 global biodiversity framework, in support of the work of the open-ended intersessional working group. The continued role of indigenous peoples and local communities and the importance of traditional and local knowledge in the post-2020 global biodiversity framework was also noted in several submissions.*

Question: How can the post-2020 global biodiversity framework facilitate the involvement of indigenous peoples and local communities and support the integration of traditional knowledge as a cross-cutting issue?

Answer:

Alongside the post-framework that is adopted, consideration could be given to acknowledging, recognizing and supporting initiatives undertaken by indigenous peoples and local communities that help understand and support biodiversity conservation, including research and other studies. This would also include recognizing the value that traditional knowledge often has for biodiversity conservation. This could embrace measures that seek to support the integration of traditional knowledge into biodiversity research and conservation. Greater recognition of indigenous peoples and local communities as stakeholders in NBSAPs could also play an important part in facilitating closer involvement too, recognizing their efforts to safeguard traditional knowledge, innovations and practices relevant for the conservation, sustainable and customary use of biodiversity. For example, the involvement of local communities in protected area management can often have important and powerful impacts.

(b) Women and gender: decision 14/34 specifies that the process for developing the post-2020 global biodiversity framework will be gender-responsive by systematically integrating a gender perspective.

Question: How should gender issues be reflected in the scope and content of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework?

Answer:

Further work in relation to identifying gender issues and their relevance to biodiversity conservation will be valuable. For example, women often play essential roles in intergenerational transmission of traditional knowledge related to biodiversity in many societies and local communities and different biodiversity relevant roles are often performed by men or women in many countries. The identification of further ways in which important gender-related actions for biodiversity conservation can be supported would certainly be a valuable contribution to the achievement of the post-2020 framework and its targets.

(c) Subnational governments, cities and other local authorities: it was observed that subnational governments, cities and other local authorities have an important role to play in on-the-ground implementation of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework and that this needs to be recognized.

Question: How should issues related to subnational governments, cities and other local authorities be reflected in the scope and content of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework?

Answer:

(Sub) Targets related to the conservation of biodiversity in cities and other urban environments, and in the adoption of effective biodiversity policies and practices related to responsible production and consumption should be particularly highlighted in the post-2020 framework, providing a means and impetus for subnational governments, cities and other local authorities to connect with and have an important role to play in on-the-ground implementation of the framework.

(d) Civil society: the need to enhance the participation, at the national, regional and international levels, of civil society in the post-2020 process was noted.

Question: How can the post-2020 global biodiversity framework facilitate the involvement of civil society in the development and implementation of the framework?

Citizen science programmes can play an increasingly important role in biodiversity conservation and should be specifically called out in the post-2020 framework. They can result in greater sharing of biodiversity knowledge, gathering of biodiversity information and greater awareness in civil groups. For example, ‘Bio-blitz’ initiatives undertaken by volunteers in many countries have already acted as valuable engagement tools. Of course, within this context it will be important to have strict and careful guidelines and protocols to govern and ensure high data quality.

Many civil society organizations are the members of existing biodiversity conservation partnerships, for example, the Global Partnership for Plant Conservation. The GPPC is an excellent illustration of how civil society organizations can be drawn in to participate in the development and implementation of the framework.

(e) Youth: the need to promote youth participation in the development and implementation of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework was noted.

Question: How can the post-2020 global biodiversity framework facilitate the involvement of youth in the development and implementation of the framework?

Answer:

Linking and integrating education for children, students and youth in general into the formal curricula and other educational programmes of schools at national and other levels will be important in connecting young people with biodiversity and its conservation. This must include greater emphasis of educational programmes in nature too, and not just in the classroom. The encouragement of more biodiversity conservation-related courses and teaching through universities will also help to support

implementation of the framework, and can be a valuable component of the necessary capacity building. Citizen science programmes in many countries designed to engage school-age children in biodiversity observations and real-world scientific research could be an extremely valuable approach to engaging youth in the framework.

New and targeted citizen science initiatives, particularly for youth audiences related to specific post-2020 targets can play an important role in involving young people in biodiversity conservation actions and in raising new awareness. In particular, there will be many new opportunities available through harnessing the power of the internet and world wide web as a source of information and engagement.

Achievement of education and awareness targets of the Global Strategy for Plant Conservation has been greatly enhanced for example by the involvement of global, regional and national networks in the botanical community, particularly notably amongst botanic gardens. There are over 3,000 botanic gardens worldwide, most of which are delivering messages on the importance of plant diversity and its conservation and hosting over 500 million visitors annually to their gardens, and comparable numbers online or through their social media posts.

(f) Private sector: it was suggested in several submissions that there is a need for greater involvement of the private sector in biodiversity issues.

Question: How should issues related to the engagement of the private sector be reflected in the scope and content of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework?

Answer:

SMART targets are better understood and receive greater support from the private sector than more generalized statements. By including SMART targets in the post-2020 global biodiversity framework, the private sector can be engaged and encouraged to support specific targets.

The post-2020 framework is more likely to be more successful if it creates clear mechanisms for private sector to engage with its implementation – including by making the voluntary commitments and reporting on their progress.

28. As noted above, many of the submissions have expressed a desire to integrate multiple and diverse perspectives in the post-2020 global biodiversity framework. As also noted above, some of the submissions have given particular attention to specific groups which should be involved and reflected in the post-2020 global biodiversity framework.

R. Communication and outreach

29. Decision 14/34 specifies that the post-2020 framework should be supported by a coherent, comprehensive and innovative communication strategy. In addition, the need for effective, coherent, comprehensive and targeted communication, both during the development of the post-2020 global

biodiversity framework and after its adoption, as well as the importance of ensuring that the framework can be easily communicated, were noted in many submissions.

Question: How should the post-2020 global biodiversity framework address issues related to communication and awareness and how can the next two years be used to enhance and support the communication strategy adopted at the thirteenth meeting of the Conference of the Parties to the Convention on Biological Diversity to ensure an appropriate level of awareness?

Answer:

The increasing engagement of a wide range of biodiversity conservation stakeholders at all levels can provide an effective means for the achievement of the communication strategy. Relying only on efforts undertaken by the Parties at governmental levels will miss many great opportunities to involve community and grassroots organizations and initiatives. For example, the engagement of the zoo and botanic garden professional communities, which attract an estimated 700 million (zoos) and 500 million (botanic gardens) visitors annually is a huge opportunity to increase communication and awareness of biodiversity. The protected area community and urban biodiversity parks and reserves also attract many millions of visitors too and can make extremely important contributions to communication and engagement strategies.

Bodies such as WWF (World Wide Fund for Nature/World Wildlife Fund), the World Association of Zoos and Aquariums (WAZA), Botanic Gardens Conservation International (BGCI) and others already encourage and support their members in public engagement on biodiversity and have sophisticated public engagement and communication programmes that can support the post-2020 global biodiversity framework. With increasing urbanization and disconnection with nature, the role of these organizations becomes increasingly important.