Subject: Initial discussion document on the post-2020 global biodiversity framework

 (Ref.: SCBD/OES/CPP/JMF/87868)

On December 26, 2018, in response to Notification 2018-102, Japan submitted its views on key elements of basic principles of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework and made specific proposals on the framework.

Our view on the key elements of basic principles included the following: (i) the scope of the Aichi Biodiversity Targets is still relevant to the framework, and therefore, it would be better to concentrate our effort in identifying and incorporating the elements to be added and/or updated, taking into account the progress after the adoption of the Aichi Biodiversity Targets, and (ii) the framework should direct us to what is to be implemented for the next ten years toward the achievement of the 2050 Vision for biodiversity “Living in Harmony with Nature.”

Our specific proposals included the following four possible elements which should be further promoted through the framework: (i) contribution through promoting the SATOYAMA Initiative, (ii) ecosystem-based approaches to climate change adaptation and disaster risk reduction, (iii) consideration for biodiversity in procurement of raw materials, and (iv) prevention from and control of unintentional introduction of invasive alien species through logistics, such as trade and transport pathways.

For details of the submission, please refer to the following URL:

<https://www.cbd.int/doc/strategic-plan/Post2020/postsbi/japan2.pdf>

Considering the importance of discussion at the regional level within the preparatory process of the framework, Japan hosted a Regional Consultation Workshop on the Post-2020 Global Biodiversity Framework for Asia and the Pacific in Nagoya from January 28 to 31, 2019, with more than 100 participants from Parties and various other stakeholders. Japan would like to continue to make positive contribution to the preparatory process of the framework by drawing on its experience of hosting COP10, where the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020 and Aichi Biodiversity Targets were adopted.

Japan notes that the discussion paper (CBD/POST2020/PREP/1/1) provides a good summary of the synthesis of submissions from Parties including Japan and other organizations, and raises a number of valuable questions. In response to Notification 2019-008, Japan would like to submit its views on some of the questions as follows.

\*Alphabetical numbers of the following questions are corresponding to the ones of the questions in the discussion paper.

**A．Structure of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework**

**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?**

Ans. As stated in the submission dated December 26, 2018, Japan is of the view that it is appropriate for the framework to have a similar structure of the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs). To be specific, the post-2020 global biodiversity framework should maintain the 2050 vision, a world of “Living in harmony with nature,” and the framework should be composed of two types of goals: (i) “outcome goals” showing the status to be achieved with keywords which are simple enough for the public to understand easily, and (ii) “output goals” showing specific actions to be implemented to achieve the outcome goals.

**B．Ambition of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework**

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

Ans. Japan considers that “ambitious” means to set targets which lead to transformative changes to realize a world of “Living in harmony with nature” and also give incentives to a wide range of stakeholders including civil society, businesses and local governments to take further actions.

**C．2050 Vision for Biodiversity**

**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?**

Ans. Japan considers it is beneficial to develop common understanding of a situation in which “Living in harmony with nature” is realized. In the process of developing the common understanding, the concepts including “No Net Loss,” “Planetary Boundaries” and “Ecological Footprint” should be taken into account.

In addition, efforts to specify a situation in which “Living in harmony with nature” is realized should be made in each Party’s National Biodiversity Strategy and Action Plan (NBSAP), taking into account the differences of the status of biodiversity, such as a type of ecosystem, and social conditions among regions and countries.

**D．Mission**

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

Ans. Japan is of the view that possible elements to be included in a 2030 mission statement are: (i) implementing actions to halt biodiversity loss and to restore biodiversity by various stakeholders, and (ii) making contribution to the achievement of SDGs through conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity.

**E．Biodiversity Targets**

**Questions:**

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

Ans. Regarding the word “measurable” in “SMART,” Japan is of the view that new targets under the post-2020 global biodiversity framework should be as quantitative as possible. However, depending on their contents, qualitative and comprehensive targets should also be allowed, considering the situations of respective regions and Parties. For example, the Aichi Biodiversity Target 11, which is typically a quantitative target, includes a qualitative element “effectively and equitably managed” which allows each Party to take necessary actions in accordance with its own situation.

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

Ans. Each of the Aichi Biodiversity Targets can be categorized into the following: ones that show the situations to be achieved (outcome situations) (e.g. Targets 1, 5, 8, 10), others that specify the concrete actions to be taken (e.g. Targets 9, 11, 16, 17), and the rest that contain both of the elements (e.g. Targets 4, 6, 13). Japan, in light of its experience in addressing mainstreaming of the Aichi Biodiversity Targets, is of the view that while it fully supports using the Aichi Biodiversity Targets as a basis for developing new targets under the post-2020 global biodiversity framework, those new targets should be distinguished accurately between the ones that show outcome situations and the others that specify concrete actions.

The steps for preparing new targets could be, for example, as follows: (i) identify elements of outcome situations and concrete actions from the Aichi Biodiversity Targets, (ii) update them as appropriate in light of the progress in their implementation and the changes in the situation surrounding biodiversity, (iii) consider additional elements to fill any gaps identified in the process of (ii) above and (iv) organize the whole elements according to the relevance to their contents. Japan believes that by taking those steps, it can be ensured that the new targets have the continuity with the Aichi Biodiversity Targets and become more “SMART,” clearly defining each of the outcome situations and the concrete actions.

Each Party’s current NBSAP is supposed to be in line with the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020 and the Aichi Biodiversity Targets, pursuant to decision X/27, and is envisaged to be revised to reflect the contents of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework once the framework is adopted. It is expected that ensuring the continuity from the Aichi Biodiversity Targets to new targets would enable each Party to maintain the continuity in its efforts for biodiversity before and after 2020.

**F．Voluntary commitments and contributions**

**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?**

Ans. Parties have made efforts for biodiversity based on their NBSAPs which have been developed or revised in line with the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020 and the Aichi Biodiversity Targets after COP10. The progress in implementation of the NBSAPs has been reviewed through national reporting. Japan is of the view that the same approach should be deployed after the adoption of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework and that the approach should not be undermined by voluntary commitments.

On the other hand, there have not been enough means for a wide range of stakeholders including civil society, businesses and local governments to declare and report their efforts for implementing the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020. Accordingly, voluntary commitments could be a means for such stakeholders to declare their commitments toward the implementation of the framework, or to promote their own goals with a view to contributing to the consideration of the framework, if they are declared before the adoption of the framework. Furthermore, we may invite reporting on the implementation of the voluntary commitments at an appropriate frequency and refer to it when reviewing the progress in the implementation of the framework.

**H．Mainstreaming**

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

Ans. Japan believes that a clear message to the society that both conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity can contribute to solving social and economic challenges should be incorporated into the post-2020 global biodiversity framework so that the mainstreaming of biodiversity will be further promoted with positive involvement of key sectors. A concrete example of the message could be that, when we regard biodiversity and natural environment as resources and start businesses which sustainably use them, circulation of human resources and capital resources would be generated, which would result in the improvement of livelihood in the region. It is also expected that the existence of such businesses would support autonomous and continuous activities for the conservation of biodiversity in the region. Japan believes that incorporating a message which calls for such a virtuous cycle into the framework would support mainstreaming.

For reference, Japan advocates the related concept of “the Circulating and Ecological Economy,” as a policy toward the realization of a sustainable society, in the fifth Basic Environment Plan approved by the Cabinet in April, 2018. “The Circulating and Ecological Economy” produces new value chains, and complements and supports regional resources by building broader networks, which is composed of natural connections (connections among forests, the countryside, rivers and the sea) and, economic connections (composed of human resources, funds, and others), while making full use of mountainous, agricultural and fishing villages, and cities. In such an economy, each region will demonstrate its strengths by taking advantage of its unique characteristics, thereby building a self-reliant and decentralized society where different resources are circulated within each region, and promoting symbiosis and exchange with neighboring regions according to unique characteristics of each region.

Activities and projects which have been conducted under the International Partnership for the SATOYAMA Initiative embody this concept.

**I．Relationship with the current Strategic Plan**

**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?**

Ans. Japan recognizes that one of the lessons learned from the implementation of the current Strategic Plan is that there was a time-lag between the adoption of the Strategic Plan and the development or revision of an NBSAP in each Party, which resulted in delay in the global-level implementation of the Strategic Plan.

Considering the discussions so far, there seems general support for the view that the post-2020 global biodiversity framework should have the continuity with the current Strategic Plan. This would help avoid delays in implementing the framework and promote continuous actions by the Parties.

**M Resource mobilization**

**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?**

Ans. Japan is of the view that we should wait to see a report which is to be developed by an expert panel that is mandated by decision 14/22. The report would provide the important information for the consideration on an element of resource mobilization.

However, Japan generally expects that the post-2020 global biodiversity framework adopts a participatory approach which helps mobilize resources from all sources.

**O．Review process**

**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?**

Ans. Japan does not see the necessity of additional mechanisms at this point. However, Japan is of the view that there is room for improving the current national reporting process in light of enhancing the accountability for the review of the implementation of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework.

Japan believes that it would be beneficial to apply indicators common to all Parties and tools to assess the progress to the national reporting process, so that the progress in the implementation of NBSAPs, which are to be revised in line with the post-2020 global biodiversity framework, can be reviewed in a more appropriate and objective manner through preparing national reports. With regard to the format of the current national report, the progress in implementing national targets set in accordance with the Aichi Biodiversity Targets is evaluated by six qualitative categories. These categories cannot provide information about the continuity of efforts, but can only indicate the situation when a report is submitted. Accordingly, an evaluation axis which objectively indicates the continuity of efforts should be added. Japan believes that these improvements to the national reporting process can contribute to strengthening the implementation of NBSAPs.

From an additional point of view, when referring to national reports in the review process of the implementation of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework, we should bear the situation of respective Parties, including their capacity and resources, in mind as much as possible.

**P．Relationship between the Convention and the Protocols**

**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?**

Ans. Some may propose digital sequence information on genetic resources as an issue associated with access and benefit-sharing. On the contrary, Japan considers that it is rather an issue associated with the conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity. Regarding digital sequence information on genetic resources, Japan is of the view that we should respect and completely follow the process determined by decision 14/20 which came after two weeks of intensive discussions at COP14. Japan also notes that the decision does not prejudge whether digital sequence information on genetic resources is addressed within the post-2020 global biodiversity framework.