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# Introduction

In response to notification 2019-075, which invites Parties to present proposals on the structure of the Post-2020 Global Biodiversity Framework (GBF), and following on the document *Possible Elements of a Post-2020 Global Biodiversity Framework for further discussion* (v2, 30 August 2019), Mexico considers that the GBF should have the following elements: 1) Rationale and scope, 2) 2050 Vision, 3) 2030 Mission, 4) goals, 5) targets and 6) indicators, accompanied by milestones and means of implementation to strengthen the structure.

Mexico believes that the Post 2020 GBF should be straight forward, hierarchical in terms of goals and targets, comprehensive, and very ambitious in face of the environmental crisis we are facing, yet flexible enough to accommodate national circumstances. It should be based on the best scientific knowledge, including recent Intergovernmental Science-Policy Platform on Biodiversity and Ecosystem Services (IPBES) assessments, the fifth edition of the Global Biodiversity Outlook (GBO5) and others as appropriate.

# Possible Elements

Regarding the elements proposed by the Co-Chairs, Mexico has the following views:

1. **Rationale and scope:** Mexico agrees to the inclusion of the issues proposed by the Co-Chairs. The rationale of the GBF should be based upon the key elements of the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020, such as *“…biological diversity underpins ecosystem functioning and the provision of ecosystem services essential for human well-being.*” This section should underline the importance of biodiversity for sustainable development and the achievement of the 2030 Agenda.

We emphasize the need for transformative change, as understood by IPBES in its latest Global Assessment Report. Nevertheless, we would welcome further clarification as to the meaning of the terms “*transformative change*” and “*theory of change*”. Additionally, with regards to the matter of principles, Mexico reaffirms its recognition of the general principles of international environmental law, including the prevention principle in accordance with Article 3 of the Convention. However, understanding these principles to be universal, and acknowledging the risk that discussing them would have in terms of potentially obstructing the negotiation process, we would support a general reference to principles stated elsewhere.

In the face of the current global biodiversity crisis, the GBF must remain ambitious yet realistic enough for its implementation by all Parties. We must incorporate the lessons learned in the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020 and aim for the adoption of an attainable and results-oriented framework.

1. **2050 Vision:** Mexico believes that the 2050 Vision, as it was originally presented in the 2011-2020 Strategic Plan, is still valid. A Vision is meant as an ultimate goal that should provide guidance for the long-term process, and it is therefore unnecessary to unpack in detail. On the contrary, it should be kept general enough to accommodate varying strategies that adjust to the dynamic nature of the complex problems it aims to address.
2. **2030 Mission:** Mexico considers that an Apex Target should not be equated to a Mission, which in terms of a strategic planning, states the purpose of an organization or a given subject. Also, it will not be suitable for communication purposes. We believe the Mission should be an action-oriented statement on fundamental actions or changes that need to take place in the short/medium term in order to fulfill or achieve our Vision. We could build on the elements of the 2020 Mission, but emphasizing the need to address the drivers of biodiversity loss. Also, we stress the need for the Mission to be suitable for communication purposes. The components of the 2050 Vision (biodiversity conservation, sustainable use, restoration and maintenance of ecosystem services) shall be considered to build on the new Mission. Additionally, it is necessary to incorporate the main drivers of biodiversity loss.

**Milestones:** we should include specific results to be expected over shorter periods of time, say every five years to ensure we are on track to achieve our goals or make the necessary adjustments to get on track. Milestones should run in parallel to the vision/mission/goal/target structure.

Mexico suggest to consider something similar to the Global Stocktake established under Article 14 of the Paris Agreement for taking stock of collective progress toward achieving the purpose of the Agreement and its long-term goals. It takes place every five years. Milestones could be the primary reference mechanism for the submission of national reports to the CBD.

1. **Goals:** Mexico considers that the goals should address the objectives of the Convention (conservation, sustainable use and access and benefit sharing) and include the elements of the 2050 Vision (biodiversity valuated, conserved, restored, wisely used and ecosystem services maintained). We believe the GBF should have a reduced number of goals, ranging from 3 to 5. Goals should be used to help structure the targets and be framed in a general format, simple and easy to communicate.

The goals should reflect the following elements:

* + - Desired status of the three levels of biological diversity (ecosystems, species and genetic diversity)
		- Drivers of biodiversity loss (direct and underlying) as mentioned in the IPBES Global Assessment

The mainstreaming of biodiversity into other sectors, knowledge, bioculture and synergies between conventions should be considered to include a goal on enabling conditions.

Mexico supports the inclusion of the Protocols in the goals, but would accept to put them aside if other countries that have not subscribe one or both of them object. However, we acknowledge the importance of including a reference to the issues of Access and Benefit Sharing and Biosafety in the GBF.

In order to update and improve the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety, it is important to conduct exhaustive analyses of the problems and challenges arising with the use of Genetically Modified Organisms (GMOs) for biodiversity conservation. The environmental release of LMOs in recent years has already generated many experiences and outcomes in different contexts, thus, we suggest to reviewing this matter in depth, as well as consulting national experiences that might be helpful.

It is important to promote the analysis of the possible risks of emerging technologies on biodiversity.

The Nagoya Protocol on access to genetic resources and the fair and equitable sharing of the benefits arising from its use faces great challenges in its implementation. It is necessary to address the different problems for mega-diverse countries. One of the challenges is to consider the issue of digital sequence information in access to genetic resources.

**Targets:** Mexico agrees to consider the issues suggested by the Co-Chairs: the Aichi Biodiversity Targets should be a starting point, but potentially simplified. Considering the ongoing progress on some Aichi Biodiversity Targets in most of the countries, we believe that the GBF should enable these processes to continue and achieve their final objectives. Therefore, we agree to build on the Aichi Biodiversity Targets, and use them as a starting point to create new targets. These targets should be very much redesigned, taking into consideration the reasons why we failed to meet them in the first place.

It is paramount to take into account the lessons learned from the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity and incorporate current conditions. We also agree that targets should be SMART (specific, measurable, achievable, results-based, and time-bound) and not duplicative. Also, targets should be consistent with other environmental agreements and processes. Mexico reiterates the level of ambition of the targets in face of the present environmental crisis.

Mexico believes that targets should be formulated upon the information of the GBO5, which will be published in May 2020. Additionally, targets should address the following topics noted in the IPBES Global Assessment:

* + - Drivers of biodiversity loss: changes in land and sea use; direct exploitation of organisms; climate change; pollution; and invasion of alien species.
		- Indirect drivers of biodiversity loss, including production and consumption patterns, human population dynamics, and trends, trade, technological innovations and local through global governance.

**Sub-targets:**

Mexico do not recommend including yet another layer of targets, however we would be open to sub-targets specifically linked to useful indicators for monitoring and evaluation. The development of single indicators for each Aichi Target was complex, hence, it might be appropriate to set sub-targets on GBF.

**Indicators:**

Mexico considers that indicators should be proposed at the target level, considering the current accepted ones, such as those identified by the CDB Conference of the Parties, those for the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development, those used in the IPBES assessments, indicators identified through the Biodiversity Indicators Partnership and by other relevant processes, as a starting point in order to monitor progress.

To achieve greater accuracy on the implementation and decision making process at the national level, we might be open to include at the sub-target level.

Indicators must be flexible enough to adapt to countries’ specific circumstances but remain homogenous enough to be comparable and consistent. The process for countries to gather information for the indicators should be simple and straight forward, taking into consideration their actual capacity to collect and report information in a timely manner.

It would be important to consider starting, along with the GBF negotiations, a process for the definition of standardized indicators, which will allow us to measure the progress towards global goals. It will be important to consider the experience under the 2030 Agenda: the United Nations Statistical Commission created the Inter-agency and Expert Group on SDG Indicators (IAEG-SDGs), chaired by Mexico and the Philippines, to develop and implement the global indicator framework for the goals and targets of the 2030 Agenda. Something similar could be implemented for the Post-2020 Framework.

1. **Means of implementation:**

Mexico considers that means of implementation should stand apart from the vision/mission/goal/target structure, and it should reflect the following key issues:

* + - resource mobilization, provision of financial resources and financial mechanisms
		- capacity building
		- science and evidence-based
		- National Biodiversity Strategies and Action Plans (NBSAP)
		- participation of relevant stakeholders and participation of Indigenous Peoples and Local Communities (IPLC)
		- providing technical rationale
		- communication and awareness raising,
		- promoting synergies
		- Enabling conditions (including mainstreaming and other cross-cutting issues)

Mexico recognizes the need to take into account the results and recommendations from the analysis of the adoption of national biodiversity strategies and action plans by eligible Parties and the advances on the integration of biodiversity and bioculture into sustainable development plans and poverty eradication strategies to incorporate lessons learnt.

It is essential to contemplate the means of implementation, particularly an efficient and transparent financing system, to encourage countries to meet goals/targets and even voluntary commitments. In the logic of the Paris Agreement, we could even think about including a global financing goal.

The implementation and evaluation of the GBF should be supported by mechanisms to provide enabling conditions for Parties and stakeholders to achieve the goals. Mexico suggests establishing a very limited number of standing committees for key issues, such as capacities, financing, transparency and/or technologies coordinated by a governance committee. This would have financial implications, so the structure must be light and highly efficient.

Regarding the possible synergies for the Post2020 GBF, we believe that different biodiversity related conventions as well as other multilateral agreements and relevant organizations have an important contribution to the Post2020 GBF, in accordance to their own mandates.

1. **Cross-cutting issues:** Mexico agrees that the following issues must not be considered peripheral and should be included in the Framework’s core (mission, goals, targets and implementation), instead of creating a single goal or target because of their relevance on multiple areas. These issues include gender equality, women’s empowerment and gender responsive approaches, intergenerational equity, bioculture, indigenous peoples and local communities.
2. **Transparent implementation, monitoring and reporting:** This section is a high priority for Mexico. Overall, we agree that the elements proposed by the Co-Chairs should be incorporated in the Post2020 GBF. However, the concept of voluntary commitments and how is it going to be established monitored and reported should be clarified. The compliance mechanism and the transparency issues should also be further clarified. Transparency must be at the forefront of all information parameters, implementation, monitoring, reports, and financial mechanisms, facing international agreements.

On voluntary commitments, Mexico would like to contribute with the following considerations:

* + - The added value of establishing national commitments must be defined, taking into account that each country already must have a National Biodiversity Strategy in compliance with the provisions of the CBD, and in some cases it is a wide-ranging document. In the Paris Agreement, the National Determined Contributions (NDC) scheme has worked to channel international cooperation’s efforts and support.
		- The legal nature of these commitments would have to be established (for example, whether binding or not, if they would have to be based on national legislation or not). Also, how are they going to be linked to the GBF global goals (for example, will countries have to contribute to each and every reformulated goal? Would they be able to choose only some goals? And if they are able to choose, under what criteria?).
		- National commitments guidelines must be developed taking into consideration minimum standards that might be followed by all parties. NDC should be flexible enough to allow each country to adapt the commitments to its own circumstances, but permit a minimum standard of comparability with other countries (for example, in terms of scope or which productive sectors are to be included).
		- A robust transparency system is also required, one which allows for recording of each country’s contributions using the same methodology (metrics and tables of common reports). The system must allow us to register to what extent each country advances, and if the aggregate of all national efforts meets global goals. Each country would have to produce progress reports with the same periodicity to allow for comparability.
1. **Outreach, awareness and uptake:** The communication strategy for the GBF will be a fundamental part towards the achievement of its objectives. Mexico believes that awareness raising and communication must be a permanent and constant action to reach the Vision in 2050. Hence, the GBF should have a specific target for this issue, following on Aichi Target 1.

Considering this is the International Year of Indigenous Languages, we must consider different native languages for our communication strategy and translate the updates targets into the most representative Indigenous Languages.

Mexico reiterates that the Post2020 GBF should be easy to communicate and attractive to the media. However, it must be easy for the public to differentiate it from the SDGs, so the media strategy needs to be unique and very appealing.

The communication strategy should be mainly focused both on digital media platforms and mass media, as well as in community media to make sure the information also reach indigenous and local communities. The text of the goals should be reduced to the minimum required to communicate a single message per target, for which the expertise of designers and science communicators will be required.

**Post2020 GBF structural model proposed by Mexico**

Based on the OEWG1 discussions on *Possible Elements of a Post 2020 global biodiversity framework for further discussion* (v2, 30th August 2019), Mexico has developed a model that takes into consideration the main elements included in the paper as well as good practices for strategic planning. Mexico agrees with a hierarchical model with a long-term vision to 2050 (as agreed for the Strategic Plan 2011-2020), a mission, goals, targets and indicators:

**Vision**: A vision statement should be a simple one-sentence view into the future with a positive outlook. It is important to strengthen holistic approaches addressing the main drivers of biodiversity loss.

**Mission Statement**: Should describe the purpose of the Post2020 GBF in a short statement. It should be action oriented and address the drivers of biodiversity loss while improving the status of biodiversity, through enhanced enabling conditions for effective implementation.

**Strategic Goals**: Desired future status on specific elements (higher level of hierarchy than target, should be more general)

The following issues should be consider in the new Framework:

* Trafficking of species: Considered the second most important cause of biodiversity loss.
* To include a Bioculture and Human Rights perspective: Given the close relationship between biodiversity and cultures, especially for indigenous peoples and local communities, it is paramount to promote the inclusion of stakeholders in the process. Unfortunately, the lack of inclusiveness and participation of other relevant actors remains as an imperative issue to address.

**Targets**: Desired future status of specific topics (below Goals, more specific)

**Indicators:** Specific quantitative objectives

This structure also considers milestones and means of implementation in a parallel track:

* **Milestones**: Specific results over a period of time established for the Post 2020 GBF, to highlight short-term achievements and ensure we are on the right track to achieve long term goals.
* **Means of implementation**: Key element to encourage countries to meet goals/targets and voluntary commitments. This might include a few Standing Committees to ensure necessary issues are made available to countries.

Communication between the Secretariat and Parties should be improved, mainly with regards to official notifications. We believe texts could be shorter and the information shall reach all stakeholders. Social Networks could be a useful tool. Also, we need to improve or generate new mechanisms for the participation of civil society and Indigenous Peoples.

Means of implementation shall take into consideration:

* + Environmental public policies, like ecosystem restoration projects and Protected Areas.
	+ Avoiding single-use plastics and promoting sustainable local transportation.
	+ Agroecological production systems.
	+ Caring of environment defenders through participation instruments, such as the Escazú Agreement in Latin America and the Caribbean.