



# IUCN's response to the Post-2020 Global Biodiversity Framework discussion paper: Part 1 Issues and Questions for Discussion

12 April 2019

**This is IUCN's response to Notification 2019-008 Part 1.** As requested we respond to the issues and questions for discussion stated in CBD/POST2020/PREP/1/1. The order of the comments in no way suggests a hierarchy of importance. Some issues are dealt with more than once given the overlap in topics.

Specific comments on target formulations and topics under the headings specified in the Annex of CBD/POST2020/PREP/1/INF/1 (IUCN's response to Notification 2019-008 Part 2) are submitted in a separate document.

## Contents

IUCN's response to the Post-2020 Global Biodiversity Framework discussion paper: Part 1 Issues and Questions for Discussion .....	1
A. Structure of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework .....	2
B. Ambition of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework.....	3
C. 2050 Vision for Biodiversity .....	4
D. Mission .....	4
E. Biodiversity Targets.....	5
F. Voluntary commitments and contributions .....	7
G. Relationship between the post-2020 global biodiversity framework and other relevant processes.....	9
H. Mainstreaming .....	10
I. Relationship with the current Strategic Plan.....	10
K. Indicators .....	11
L. Implementation and NBSAPs .....	12
M. Resource mobilization .....	12
N. Financial mechanisms.....	13
O. Review process .....	14
P. Relationship between the Convention and the Protocols.....	14
Q. Integrating diverse perspectives .....	15
R. Communication and outreach .....	18

## ISSUES AND QUESTIONS FOR DISCUSSION

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

*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?*

1. An effective structure for the post-2020 global biodiversity framework should reflect and communicate a logical arrangement of its elements (Strategic Goals) that communicate the imperative to attain an overarching objective (Mission for 2030) and a long term goal (Vision for 2050).
2. Achievement of the framework's Mission and ultimately the long term goal (Vision) will require 'transformational change' (see Section B) through a fundamental societal shift; one which seriously steps up implementation efforts including through mainstreaming of biodiversity into economic development and planning, and facilitates the contributions needed from all sectors of society towards the Mission and Vision.
3. The five Strategic Goals of the current Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020 (encompassing tackling the underlying causes of biodiversity loss, alleviating the direct pressures, improvement of biodiversity status, enhancing the benefits to all, and supporting implementation of responses) provide a strong basis for the development of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework.
4. The results of this required transformational change (see Sections B & D) need to be targeted (and monitored) in terms of outcomes for biodiversity and thus delivery of the goals of the Convention. The achievement of the 2030 Mission therefore needs to be organised through targets that speak directly to the status of biodiversity (mostly **current Strategic Goal C**) in other words, successors of Aichi Targets 5, 12, 13, expressed as outcomes.
5. Such outcome targets need to be supported by targets to tackle pressures on biodiversity and their drivers. Tackling the direct pressures on biodiversity needs urgent attention (**current Strategic Goal B**).
6. Measures for addressing such pressures, structured in relation to desired outcomes, would address the drivers of loss (ecosystem / habitat loss and degradation, climate change, invasive alien species, excessive nutrient loads and all forms of pollution, over-exploitation and unsustainable use). As now, targets could be structured under these drivers (successors of Targets 6, 7, 8, 9, 10).
7. Achievement of biodiversity outcomes would be supported by targets for the benefits (to people and nature) of conserving biodiversity (**current Strategic Goal D**; successors to Targets 14 - 16) and essential response targets (**current Strategic Goal E**; successors to Targets 11 & 17 - 20).
8. The underlying causes of biodiversity loss need to be addressed by mainstreaming biodiversity across government and society (**current Strategic Goal A**: successors to Targets 1, 2, 3, 4), including through synergies with other relevant policy frameworks.
9. In this way, the current five Strategic Goals would all become a part of the framing of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework. The current Aichi Targets, albeit modified, would also fit recognisably within such a framework. A suggested framework is illustrated below:



10. The relationship and inter-dependence between all the targets that form the post-2020 global biodiversity framework should be made clear, as in such a pyramid figure, noting that the levels of the pyramid do not represent a hierarchy of importance.

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

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

1. ‘Ambitious’ in this context means requiring a complete change to the current way of living leading to so called “transformational change” i.e. a complete change in the way the world functions economically and socially, which is evidently failing to achieve sustainable development” at present.
2. The content of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework must incorporate scaled-up actions, from all actors of society, that summed up will lead up to the transformational change that will achieve the 2030 Mission and ultimately the 2050 Vision for biodiversity.
3. Ambition could also be understood as the new framework being a truly global framework for biodiversity, not a framework for the Convention on Biological Diversity only; a framework to unify all Parties, Conventions, and all stakeholders who impact /depend on biodiversity.
4. Such ambition requires that all elements of the framework: Vision, Mission, and successors to the Aichi Targets should allow for contributions or commitments (and thus be scalable) from not only individual countries but also from non-state actors (see Section E).
5. The ambition of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework must be aligned with what can in reality be achieved biophysically. In the long-term of the 2050 Vision, comprehensive restoration and recovery are essential. This should be initiated as soon as possible, but will not yield benefits at scale by 2030.
6. Halting current threats can be delivered over the immediate ten-year timeframe of the 2030 Mission, however. Given this, an appropriate formulation for the 2030 Mission would be based on “Net Gain” or “No Net Loss” (see Section D).

7. It is important that the post-2020 framework does not reduce the level of ambition, despite the challenges to the implementation of the current Aichi Targets. Rather, the post-2020 global biodiversity framework needs to include policy mechanisms and updated review processes, to ensure that the action taken is commensurate with, and therefore adequately addresses, the enormous challenge we face.
8. Overall, a great deal of political will and determination is needed to do what is necessary to secure life on Earth.

### C. 2050 Vision for Biodiversity

***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?***

1. The 2050 Vision “Living in harmony with nature” encompasses conservation (abating threats and preventing further loss), restoration, recovery, sustainable use and benefit-sharing for all people. IUCN supports this Vision, and given its 2050 timeline, recommends that it be retained for the post-2020 global biodiversity framework.
2. It would be very valuable to establish a small number of long term targets (see Section E) to underpin the 2050 Vision. Such targets could should both operationalise the 2050 Vision, and provide “landing lights” towards which shorter-term targets for 2030 should be heading (successors to the Aichi Targets linked to the 2030 Mission).
3. Such 2050 targets could include, for example, “*Eliminate species extinction risks elevated by human activities*” (equivalent to “*Improve the survival probability of all species to background rates/ that natural over Earth’s history*”) and “*Reduce the risk of collapse of all ecosystems to background rates*”. Given the multi-decadal timeframes necessary for ecological recovery and restoration, delivery of such targets is not possible by 2030. However, articulating such a level of ambition for 2050 reveals the urgency of implementation by 2030 of short-term actions necessary for the achievement of such targets.

### D. Mission

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

1. The Mission should be an actionable *planetary science-based target*<sup>1</sup> for biodiversity (equivalent to the 2°C/1.5°C temperature rise cap agreed under the Paris Climate Change Agreement) as the foundation for the future for humanity and all life on Earth, that can be quantified and tracked through implementation.
2. A new Mission for 2030 (overarching objective or so called “Apex target” or “planetary science-based target”) is essential to galvanise the necessary action. The Mission in turn should be able to be disaggregated into “specific science-based targets” for individual actors and stakeholders. These include both countries and non-State actors such as cities and sub-national governments, indigenous and local communities, women, youth, farmers, and the private sector.
3. The 2030 Mission should be phrased in active language and be forward looking and enabling; a ‘call to action’ which communicates why this matters to people.

---

<sup>1</sup> See Sections E and H for further information on science-based targets.

4. It should be succinct, action-oriented, bold, measurable (focusing on all three biodiversity components: species, ecosystems, genetic diversity) and be consistent with the CBD's definition of biodiversity.
5. The following formulation could be considered for the 2030 Mission: *Implement all actions necessary and sufficient to halt the loss of species, ecosystems, and genetic diversity, as essential for achievement of the 2050 Vision and sustainable development.*
6. The Mission could be accompanied by a popular slogan which resonates with the public, such as *Save Life on Earth Now / tomorrow will be too late.*
7. Such a 2030 Mission would be in line with “bending the curve” (reducing the loss of biodiversity, then switching to restoration and recovery) and “retention” (ensuring conservation of remaining biodiversity, encompassing genetic diversity, species and ecosystems). Both of these formulations (and others under discussion by others including some IUCN Members), imply “no more net loss” as a milestone towards net gain, and are directly equivalent to stabilising condition.
8. These formulations are also consistent with a proposed “global mitigation hierarchy” which expresses a means of working to “no net loss” by 2030”. This draws from the well-established “mitigation hierarchy” approach to structure biodiversity targets: it could be applied at, for example, a national level to the post-2020 global biodiversity targets.
9. IUCN notes that the **Decade on Ecosystem Restoration 2021 – 2030** is an opportunity to leverage a global call for restoration at scale across terrestrial, freshwater, marine and coastal ecosystems generating a civil society movement for restoration action (including opportunities for ‘green jobs’) for restoration action. The Decade offers an unmatched opportunity to reinforce ecosystem restoration as a delivery mechanism for the 2050 Vision.
10. Early results from analytical modelling demonstrate that it would be possible to stabilise the status of biodiversity by 2030 while also feeding humanity and halting climate change.

## **E. Biodiversity Targets**

### **Science-based targets:**

1. The concept of *science-based targets* has emerged over recent years based on experience in climate change policy under the Paris Agreement. This established a “planetary science-based target” (i.e., restricting climate change to below 1.5-2°C), which can then be disaggregated into “specific science-based targets” for individual actors (e.g. cities, provinces, companies, and, indeed, countries) to determine the contributions that they need to make if the planetary science-based target is to be achieved. For the post-2020 biodiversity framework, we envision the 2030 Mission as the “planetary science-based target” (Section D1). If formulated along the lines of *Implement all actions necessary and sufficient to halt the loss of species, ecosystems, and genetic diversity, as essential for achievement of the 2050 Vision and sustainable development* (Section D5), this could be subdivided according to individual levels of biodiversity (Section A4) and the mitigation of pressures necessary to maintain these (Sections A5-6). Crucially, it could also be disaggregated to allow individual actors to determine “specific science-based targets” as the contributions that they need to make if it is to be achieved.

2. There are also several references in this submission to “specific science-based targets”. In essence, these address the actions necessary to remove recorded threats to species and ecosystems in the area over which the actor in question has responsibility. Ideally, both the 2030 Mission itself (i.e. the planetary science-based target) and the targets established under the post-2020 global biodiversity framework should be able to be disaggregated into “specific science-based targets” to allow Parties – and indeed non-state actors – to establish their specific contributions towards the global targets, and be able to measure and account for them accordingly.
3. The methodology for the formulation and measurement of science-based targets is under development by IUCN, UNEP WCMC and other institutions. Given the massive potential for effective mainstreaming of biodiversity considerations in government operations, the issue of science-based targets is dealt with in more detail under mainstreaming (Section H).
4. Any sector or entity with demonstrable commitments to implementation of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework should be able to contribute to it. IUCN proposes to showcase a suite of proof-of-concept specific science-based targets from a range of sectors at the 2020 IUCN World Conservation Congress in Marseille, to build momentum towards final negotiations at CBD COP 15.

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

5. **SMART Targets:** Targets in the post-2020 framework should be formulated as SMART targets that contribute to the 2030 Mission, organised according to a pyramid type structure (Section A11).
6. It will be very important to increase **Specificity** and **Measurability** across all targets. There will be a challenging balance between **Ambition** and **Realism** in the post-2020 targets: they must express necessity (i.e. be ambitious) as well as feasibility. It follows that ambitious targets may be deemed unrealistic by some, but IUCN points that a high level of ambition will be necessary to secure planetary life support systems.
7. In terms of **Time-defined**, post-2020, specific and measureable science-based targets should have clear quantifiable outcomes that demonstrably contribute to the 2030 Mission. In effect these targets for 2030 will be milestones towards the 2050 endpoint of "Living in Harmony with Nature". Therefore, clear links need to be established between the targets, Mission and Vision (and their contribution to the SDGs).
8. They should also be able to be disaggregated into potential contributions and commitments towards their achievement by individual entities (see comments on science-based targets).
9. One feature of those Aichi Targets where significant progress has been made is the level of quantification and attribution that is possible. Targets that are clearly measurable (and ensure accountability) tend to be much further advanced. Other targets are phrased in a way that makes them hard to measure.
10. Parties should ideally adopt a framing for the national level targets that is similar to the global target, using the same metrics as the global targets to assist both implementation and monitoring. (Simplified reporting and review mechanisms could help facilitate this).

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

1. The 20 Aichi Targets are overall well-conceived and should be used as a guiding the development of successor targets.
2. However, efforts towards analysing the reasons behind the implementation “gap” overall and the differences in the level of implementation of some Aichi Targets against others must be continued.
3. Targets in the new framework need to be supported by a clear, analytical rationale (why is the target set at a particular level?), that is consistent with the 2030 Mission. Outcome targets (such as current Aichi Targets 5, 12 and 13) should be differentiated from process ones (see Section A).
4. Targets should be supported by a rationale by means of implementation. This would be in addition to **Strategic Goal E** which includes essential response measures. In addition, we suggest that each target should be supported by a clear implementation plan. This echoes the approach taken by the SDGs which contain supporting targets.

**(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?***

1. The SDGs are dependent on the integrity of the biosphere and so it is essential that biodiversity conservation is considered at the heart of the development mainstream. As such, the post-2020 global biodiversity framework must be designed and adopted as an integral part of the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development.
2. 2020 is the achievement date for the SDG targets that directly reflect the Aichi targets of the current Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011–2020. SDG targets that have an end date of 2020 need to be updated to harmonise and be consistent with the post-2020 global biodiversity framework.
3. As yet there is no ‘official’ process to amend these SDG targets that have timelines for 2020. Whilst it is acknowledged that this will be a complex process, it must be addressed urgently so that the SDGs continue to call for action to ensure the essential underpinning of nature conservation to society and the economy. The Convention (e.g. through the High Level Panel to be set up following the COP14 decision), and the biodiversity community at large, needs to engage with the UN as soon as possible to achieve this.
4. IUCN reiterates that a key challenge will be to ensure that efforts to achieve the SDGs (e.g. major infrastructure development), minimise negative impacts on biodiversity. This is fundamental for the achievement of sustainable development.

**F. Voluntary commitments and contributions**

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

1. **Before CBD COP15:** Voluntary commitments for biodiversity made by Parties should be used to build momentum for biodiversity conservation post-2020, and represent an increase in current ambition (Decision 14/34).
2. Such commitments by Parties should ideally be in the form of “pledges” that in effect go ‘over and above’ current implementation and ambition efforts to achieve the Strategic Plan (2011-2020). We suggest that these link to the current Aichi targets; post-2020 they should be mapped to the successor targets.

3. Parties, if they so wish, could make a 'final' big push – towards meeting the Aichi targets before 2020 (e.g. announcing increased coverage of Key Biodiversity Areas through protected areas or further aligning national ABS legislation to the Nagoya Protocol).
4. We agree that voluntary commitments for biodiversity should also be strongly encouraged from non-State actors: from all sectors who have important contributions to make to biodiversity conservation. These actors are encouraged to develop such commitments before COP15 and make this information available as a contribution to (and to be held in) the Sharm El Sheikh to Kunming Action Agenda for Nature and People as called for at COP14.
5. Examples for collecting voluntary commitments which could provide important lessons are international platforms such as: SE4ALL, the Global Compact, Clinton Global Initiative, Rio+20 (Barbados Declaration).
6. **Post-2020 (after CBD COP15)** following adoption of the new global biodiversity framework, the voluntary commitments made by Parties should be reflected in the new framework through national level targets that directly contribute (and link to) to global targets formulated to bring about action commensurate with the global biodiversity challenge.
7. To achieve this, it will be necessary to recognize that Parties have different national conditions and therefore have differentiated responsibilities as enshrined in Rio Principle 7 (adopted through several articles of the CBD): *States shall co-operate in a spirit of global partnership to conserve, protect and restore the health and integrity of the Earth's ecosystem. In view of the different contributions to global environmental degradation, States have common but differentiated responsibilities. The developed countries acknowledge the responsibility that they bear in the international pursuit of sustainable development in view of the pressures their societies place on the global environment and of the technologies and financial resources they command.*
8. Such national targets represent a commitment by Parties in line with Principle 7; be a contribution to a global target; represent an appropriate contribution dependent on the formulation of the global target.
9. Each national target would be science-based and connect to global targets in a way that makes clear the national level contribution to the global target (in this way the national level targets would take into account the precise conditions of each country).
10. Such national targets would ideally be formulated as specific science-based targets (i.e., they would be additive across all Parties to yield the results necessary to deliver the 2030 Mission). IUCN, WWF, and the French Government are currently piloting what these might look like, by supporting a dozen countries with establishing their future contributions to the commitments made at COP15 in 2020.
11. **Post-2020 (after CBD COP15)** there should be strong encouragement for voluntary commitments from non-State actors to continue. Both the magnitude of such commitments (at all scales from local to global) and the number of contributors will need to expand.
12. A new (overarching) mechanism to hold and share commitments from non-State actors and measure progress towards the 2030 Mission, their impacts, and gaps, needs to be developed. This would be a powerful tool to track and manage implementation and incentivize further action. Such recognition, quantification, reporting and monitoring of

these contributions will be essential to ramp up biodiversity conservation and unleash transformational systems change. It will be important to avoid a multiplicity of online platforms disconnected from each other and from the process, as well as address some of the shortcomings in current voluntary commitments such as difference in formats resulting in incompatibility making aggregation impossible.

13. National level targets also need to embrace the effects of their imports and exports of threats to biodiversity. For instance, given that marine plastic waste originates from land-based consumption, landlocked countries still need to contribute to marine targets that aim to reduce such pollution. The same applies to the import of timber species that may not be harvested sustainable, or to the biodiversity impacts of the consumption of palm oil.

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

*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?*

1. Coherence, integration and a holistic approach would be maximised through developing the framework as an integrated and truly global strategy and action plan to help achieve the CBD, the SDGs and a number of other critical conventions and policy instruments (such as, the Sendai Framework for Disaster Risk Reduction).
2. Critically, synergies and complementarities between the SDGs and the global biodiversity framework in the post-2020 period should be strengthened and harmonised.
3. Such an approach should involve substantially increased cooperation between the CBD (and its Protocols) and the other two Rio Conventions and biodiversity-related conventions through the creation of common reporting frameworks, thus minimising national reporting burdens, reducing implementation costs.
4. IUCN recommends that the post-2020 global biodiversity framework is also anchored in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination Against Women (CEDAW), the 1995 Beijing Declaration and Platform for Action, and the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples (UNDRIP).
5. Contributions to the post-2020 global biodiversity framework made across other Conventions need to be taken account of in NBSAPs, and ultimately at the global level. In this way, NBSAPs would be strengthened and countries could identify additional sources of progress regarding biodiversity targets when implementing action on climate change or desertification, for example.
6. Links to other relevant conventions are also essential to truly address the underlying causes and direct drivers of biodiversity loss. The initiative at COP14 taken by the Government of Egypt to bring this about for the three Rio Conventions must be fully supported.
7. In addition, the contribution of Parties and non-state actors towards these other MEAs should be taken in account in any reporting framework developed for the post-2020 framework. This will allow for a more holistic view of the impacts of the actions by Parties and non-state actors, on biodiversity. Measuring the impacts of such

agreements using the same science-based target methodology will enable impacts to be aggregated in an efficient manner.

8. A significant but key challenge will be to ensure that funds for development assistance (ODA), e.g. in support of achievement of SDGs 2, 7, 9 and others, do not have negative impacts on the biodiversity – that is fundamental for the achievement of sustainable development.

## **H. Mainstreaming**

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

1. The full internalisation of biodiversity considerations in the operations (and investment in activities that undermine nature) is a critical prerequisite to achieving the change necessary throughout society and in relation to the economy.
2. The SDGs provide an enabling framework for mainstreaming biodiversity and ecosystem services across all government departments, scales and sectors.
3. The development of mechanisms to disaggregate global targets into national targets that are then further disaggregated into science-based targets oriented towards specific sectors (agriculture, climate change, energy, fisheries and commercial forestry) would facilitate mainstreaming.
4. The success of a truly transformative post-2020 global biodiversity framework will be dependent on the contribution of both State and non-State actors (see Section F).
5. The Chennai Guidance for the Integration of Biodiversity and Poverty Eradication should be a key source of guidance to facilitate mainstreaming.
6. IUCN and many IUCN Members are addressing science-based targets in a number of ways. The IUCN Species Survival Commission (SSC) and its Post-2020 Task Force is currently engaging with a number of Parties on potential national pilots for assessment of specific “science-based targets”. The Coalition for Private Investment in Conservation is exploring similar methods development with the financial sector, while the Science-based Targets Network (encompassing both IUCN and many IUCN Members) is in the process of developing such methods for cities and companies.
7. Across this diversity of sectors, IUCN proposes to showcase a suite of proof-of-concept specific “science-based targets” at the 2020 IUCN World Conservation Congress in Marseille, to build momentum towards final negotiations at CBD COP 15.

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

***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?***

1. In effect the lessons learned are enshrined in our answers to the preceding sections. Both implicitly and explicitly, we have spelt out a number of improvements that translate into lessons learned: an improved structure, an outcome-based Mission, the development of targets that are science-based to underpin mainstreaming, the contribution of both State and non-State actors at levels commensurate with the challenge we face – to name but some. It is also important that a complete indicator framework is available at the start of implementation of the new framework.

2. Regarding the transition from the current to the next decade it is important to stress that all efforts to achieve the current Aichi Targets should continue and to make optimal and efficient use the time before COP15 to take the necessary decisions that facilitate immediate implementation of the new global biodiversity framework.
3. The lack of compliance has been a problem. Compliance with existing environmental laws, policies, licenses, permits etc. must be strengthened in the post-2020 global framework. If all the existing environment management and protection rules were followed, there would be vastly improved biodiversity conservation outcomes. It is important to note that compliance does not mean just enforcement; it means a holistic and integrated analysis of what compliance activities/resources/systems are in place (from education to HR capacity to equipment to institutional systems); a consideration of the challenges and gaps, and analysis of problems and developing implementation strategies to address them. A major challenge is capacity building regarding environmental compliance.

## **K. Indicators**

***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?***

1. It is essential to build synergies between implementation and reporting. As mentioned above (in Section I), the indicator framework for the post-2020 global biodiversity framework needs to be designed at the same time as it is developed, in order to begin monitoring implementation straight away, and to strengthen future monitoring, reporting and verification.
2. Indicators for the post-2020 framework should be based on the existing suite of indicators. This is beneficial as many of the indicators developed to measure global-level progress towards the Aichi Targets and the Global Biodiversity Outlook (reflected by those indicators mobilised through the Biodiversity Indicators Partnership) also measure progress towards other global goals, such as the SDGs. Similarly, they are used in IPBES global, regional and thematic assessments. This allows for consistency and comparability across assessment and monitoring processes.
3. Through simultaneous reporting and tracking, indicators should systematically demonstrate contributions towards achievement of the SDGs and other MEAs, to reduce reporting burdens. Inputs from organizations such as the UN Statistical Commission, the UN Economic Commissions and the Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development may help to provide greater alignment with the SDGs.
4. The development of the post-2020 framework should make use of global indicators that can be aggregated from and disaggregated back to the national level.
5. The review process could be expanded to focus also on potential sectoral targets that seek to implement global targets.
6. Targets in the post-2020 framework should be structured as contributions towards the 2030 Mission, and thus indicators for these targets should also be structured so as to reflect explicit contributions of specific actions (e.g. protected areas) towards the Mission.
7. The indicator framework should be developed to support the structure of the post-2020 framework. Therein, there will be some indicators that track progress towards targets that address drivers of biodiversity loss, essential response targets, implementation

targets and outcome targets. It will be valuable to review the suitability of the existing suite of indicators as targets are developed, and to identify any gaps.

8. There has been a significant investment in the indicators used to measure progress towards the Aichi Targets. It is essential that all indicators are sustainably funded and will be available throughout the reporting period. Furthermore, all indicators should be championed by an identified responsible organisation, which is committed to producing and contributing their indicator(s) into the future. Focusing on a smaller number of relevant indicators is a priority post-2020.
9. The [BIP Dashboard](#) and the [Integrated Biodiversity Assessment Tool \(IBAT\)](#) will continue to be valuable tools for supporting the availability and visualisation of such indicators at the global and national level.

## **L. Implementation and NBSAPs**

***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?***

1. Ideally, post-2020, NBSAPs would be amended and “formatted” to support national targets (that are science-based). A template for these could be designed to align such targets to the successors of the Aichi Targets and the 2030 Mission.
2. NBSAPs would be complemented with a mechanism to hold voluntary biodiversity commitments from non-State actors.
3. NBSAPs should support implementation (and minimise trade-offs) of all three Rio Conventions and the biodiversity-related conventions as well as relevant contributions to the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development.
4. Mechanisms to improve transparency in the implementation of NBSAPs should be developed in reporting system developed for the post-2020 framework.
5. Monitoring effort will need to be scaled-up to assess whether national targets would ‘add up’ in terms of their impact, to yield the intent of the global target when “combined with” voluntary commitments for biodiversity made by non-State actors.
6. National reporting will need to encompass a process for conducting ‘global stocktakes’ to monitor progress on implementation (and determine both ‘ambition gaps’ and ‘commitment gaps’) against established global biodiversity targets at fixed intervals to enable countries to periodically enhance (‘ratchet up’) global ambition over time.

## **M. Resource mobilization**

***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?***

1. The financing and mobilisation of resources should be an integral part of the development and implementation of the new post-2020 global biodiversity framework.
2. Implementation of a post-2020 global biodiversity framework should be aligned to and supported by a capacity-building strategy (identifying resource requirements of the various elements of the framework) developed at the same time.
3. A combination of both private and public finance will be essential to achievement the new global biodiversity targets, with a smart focus on how resources are deployed.

The aim should be to build sustainable local and national economies that generate economic benefits while increasing the stock of biodiversity.

4. Inspiring other sectors to contribute through science-based targets will, by default, ramp up resources for biodiversity conservation.
5. In addition to calling for increasing public funding from Governments, a global call for voluntary financial contributions for the implementation of the framework to the private and philanthropy sector should be part of a resource mobilisation strategy for the post-2020 global biodiversity framework.
6. Annual global conservation needs are estimated to be USD 300 - 400 billion, including approximately USD 80 billion to reduce extinction risk for threatened species and safeguard key biodiversity areas, very far from the current flows of funds to conservation estimated around USD 52 billion per year.
7. The greatest part of current funding is domestic government spending in developed countries, instead of developing countries where the greatest need for funding exists. Maintaining and increasing public sector finance is essential; one immediate need is to ramp up biodiversity-related official development aid (currently c. USD 10 billion).
8. Increasing attention is also being paid to incorporation of exported and imported impacts (“telecoupling”) through a range of biodiversity “footprinting” techniques. This will allow the import and export of impacts through trade flows between Parties (the export and import of biodiversity threats) to be addressed.
9. Public sector finance and philanthropic capital alone are not sufficient to address the gap. Therefore, the mobilization and leveraging of private investment, as mandated for the 2030 Sustainable Development Agenda by the Addis Ababa Action Agenda on Financing for Development, must continue and be amplified.
10. Multilateral financial institutions such as the World Bank, as well as national, regional and local financial institutions, have a major role to play in increasing the flow of private investment to conservation. They should support such flows by offering specific risk mitigation tools (both in grant form and in concessional finance) focused on local and regional entrepreneurs that are developing deals that offer specific biodiversity outcome benefits, ideally measured using the science-based targets approach, that can build local sustainable economies.

## **N. Financial mechanisms**

*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?*

1. The integrated approach towards biodiversity loss, land degradation and climate change should be a central theme throughout the post 2020 framework, including within the context of the UN Decade on Ecosystem Restoration and the Egyptian Initiative. As these are all three focal areas for the GEF, and since GEF promotes a multifocal approach, the GEF could make more funding available to eligible Parties towards the post-2020 framework by increasing the request for projects that address biodiversity loss, land degradation and climate change in an integrated way. This would support the development of strong synergistic approaches to these three threats and obtain better results

2. The GEF can support increased financial flows to biodiversity conservation by providing technical assistance grant funding and concessional finance (through their Non-Grant Facility) to project developers that are building investment opportunities for the private sector. GEF can ensure that such arrangements support biodiversity conservation by applying science-based targets approaches to their selection criteria.
3. IUCN draws attention to the fact that the data used to determine STAR allocations should be made more comprehensive to include assessments of species from all realms (e.g. freshwater and marine). This is an argument for resources to ensure that The IUCN Red List of Threatened Species becomes a complete Barometer of Life.

## **O. Review process**

***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?***

1. It would be valuable for both Parties and non-State actors, if basic formats and processes for reporting, monitoring and review are identified at the same time as a post-2020 global biodiversity framework is adopted. Consistency of format over time allows for more stable reporting processes, and increased opportunity for alignment with other reporting processes.
2. The establishment of coordination mechanisms for the achievement of individual or groups of related post-2020 targets could be considered, to help with coordination of effort, resource mobilization, monitoring, and implementation. This has worked successfully for the Global Strategy for Plant Conservation.
3. See Section F where it is emphasised that national reporting needs to encompass a new process for conducting 'global stocktakes' to monitor progress on implementation against established global biodiversity targets at fixed intervals to enable countries to periodically enhance ('ratchet up') global ambition and action over time.
4. Review processes should also allow for both review of implementation at the biodiversity-outcome level, as well as information on the effectiveness and implementation of national policies and processes underpinning the post-2020 framework. Such a reporting and review process should be largely transparent, in order to share success stories between Parties.
5. Parties have asked for greater collaboration between Secretariats of MEAs to synergise reporting and review mechanisms for biodiversity-related conventions. Such improvements could include harmonised online tools for national reporting.

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

***(a) What are the issues associated with biosafety under the Convention and what are the implications for the post-2020 global biodiversity framework?***

1. The Nagoya Protocol relates to one of the three objectives of the CBD and links to implementation of the other two, and is also the subject of Aichi Target 16. As such it is important that its operations are brought into the post-2020 global biodiversity framework.
2. The provisions of access and benefit-sharing under the Nagoya Protocol should be applied and integrated across the global biodiversity framework, as should the

provisions of the Cartagena Protocol. This relates to both the process of preparation of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework as well as its actual content and design.

3. The fact that the Open-Ended Working Group (OEWG) on the Post-2020 process will consider the outcome of the Ad Hoc Technical Expert Group on Digital Sequence Information is positive and will help consideration of this issue in a more holistic way in the design of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework.
4. As these issues are considered it will be important to eventually clarify the degree to which the issues of Synthetic Biology and Digital Sequence Information (extremely difficult issues both technically and politically) are already addressed under existing CBD mechanisms (specifically, the degree to which synthetic biology is addressed under the Cartagena Protocol, and the degree to which DSI is addressed under the Nagoya Protocol).
5. Such discussion will help determine how the Strategic Plan for the Cartagena Protocol and the Nagoya Protocol can be included (or linked to) in a post-2020 global biodiversity framework.
6. Ongoing IUCN work, based on the IUCN assessment of the subject, can help guide the way forward in consideration of both the positive and the negative interactions between biodiversity conservation and synthetic biology. Note that IUCN is developing a policy on synthetic biology to be discussed and voted upon by IUCN's Membership in the 2020 Marseille World Conservation Congress.
7. Despite the intent of the Nagoya Protocol, illegal access to genetic resources continues. The post-2020 global biodiversity framework must continue to shine a light on compliance with the ABS provisions of the Convention in general as well as with the Nagoya Protocol in particular.

***(b) 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?***

8. In addition to the comments mentioned above, IUCN considers that further thought is needed on the content of specific targets related to the Nagoya Protocol (and ABS in general) under the new framework.
9. Within the context of access and benefit-sharing, regarding commitments to science-based targets, Parties may wish to consider voluntary contributions made by non-State actors towards ABS, subject to ABS legislation.
10. Both State and non-State actors may provide contributions towards other national biodiversity targets and commitments (e.g. a company may make a contribution to a Party's nationally-established biodiversity commitments, which is different to the country in which that company is registered). Such contributions should also be monitored and reported, within the framework of reporting national biodiversity commitments. This would require mutual agreement between foreign organisations and Parties.

**Q. Integrating diverse perspectives**

***(a) Indigenous peoples and local communities: 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?***

- 1. Human rights and biodiversity:** Biodiversity and human rights are part of the 2030 Agenda and are strongly interconnected. Biodiversity is necessary for the ecosystem services that support human existence through a wide range of human rights, including the rights to life, health, food, water and culture. In order to protect human rights, biodiversity must be protected and vice versa. Without a peaceful and safe existence, that supports local livelihoods, no conservation commitment can be expected from local people.
2. The knowledge, innovations and practices of indigenous and local communities (IPLCs) are an essential consideration for the structure of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework. This should include ensuring representative decision-making and advocating for wider application of traditional knowledge toward biological conservation, with consent from, involvement of and equitable benefit-sharing for holders of this knowledge.
3. Land and resource tenure is a major issue which connects the rights of IPLCs and vulnerable populations with conservation. Indigenous Peoples manage or have tenure rights over at least ~38 million km<sup>2</sup> in 87 countries: over a quarter of the world's land surface, intersecting about 40% of all terrestrial protected areas and ecologically intact landscapes, and its management is critical to achieving the objectives of the CBD.
4. There is an urgent need to protect the rights of those who are most vulnerable to the degradation and loss of biodiversity and reflect these in the post-2020 global biodiversity framework. Many of the practices, traditional knowledge and collective actions of Indigenous peoples are not recognized. It is essential that indigenous peoples and local communities are encouraged (and supported) to increase their engagement in both national and local policy, and the entire CBD process.
5. IUCN highlights the need for the post-2020 global biodiversity framework to strengthen its support for, and improve the protection of, environmental human rights defenders including through legal instruments and other measures to improve their safety.

***(b) Women and gender: How should gender issues be reflected in the scope and content of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework?***

1. A gender-responsive, socially-inclusive process is fundamental to developing, agreeing and ultimately enabling effective implementation of a post-2020 global biodiversity framework that empowers women, men, indigenous peoples and local communities, and should be integrated throughout the post-2020 biodiversity framework.
2. The post-2020 framework should build on the 2015-2020 Gender Plan of Action. Gender-responsive approaches to biodiversity conservation and recognition of women's rights, gender equality, social equity and good governance, should be embedded in the post-2020 global biodiversity framework. Gender considerations based on best practice should be fully mainstreamed in NBSAPs.

***(c) Subnational governments, cities and other local authorities: 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?***

1. Subnational governments, cities and other local authorities should be encouraged to develop and implement sub-national or local biodiversity contributions, based on establishment and delivery of specific science-based targets.
2. However, subnational issues should be clearly nested under national actions, with assignment of responsibilities appropriately. Focus should be on strengthening the national level institutional and technical capacity to address finer scale issues under their jurisdictions.
3. It is important to maintain a balance between rural and urban issues in terms of actions and funding. A strong move towards urban/cities focus, driven by demographic shift, may risk insufficient attention being placed elsewhere. Most biodiversity, of course, does not occur in cities per se (although urban biodiversity can be very important in its own right). However, many of the drivers of loss of biodiversity, in all areas, emanate from cities, especially through their consumption.
4. Partnership coalitions and knowledge networks that focus on issues identified as common priorities shared by multiple places (across geographies and national borders) would be beneficial (e.g. water stewardship programmes for megacities).

***(d) Civil society: How can the post-2020 global biodiversity framework facilitate the involvement of civil society in the development and implementation of the framework?***

1. CBD processes are progressive in relation to the involvement of civil society. Civil society from all regions of the world should be invited to be actively involved in the development and implementation of the framework. Civil society has vast knowledge and network to contribute to a post-2020 global biodiversity framework to take actions to stop biodiversity loss.

***(e) Youth: How can the post-2020 global biodiversity framework facilitate the involvement of youth in the development and implementation of the framework?***

1. Youth needs to be fully and meaningfully engaged in the development of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework. Youth should be represented in Party and Stakeholder delegations. Where possible, the engagement should also be facilitated through a Youth Forum to seek inputs from Youth in the development and implementation of the framework.
2. The involvement of youth in the development and implementation of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework should also be duplicated at the national level.

***(f) Private sector: 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?***

1. The post-2020 global biodiversity framework must be "owned" by all relevant actors. IUCN endorses the proposal being put forward by the Global Partnership for Business and Biodiversity regarding the engagement of Business in the post-2020 global biodiversity framework. The business community has much to contribute, and a clear framework for contributions by non-state actors through the establishment and delivery of specific science-based targets, prepared with the involvement of business, could have substantial impact.
2. Further, business has a strong role to play in issues such as contributions to science, knowledge, and data-generation, generation of guidelines such as the role of business

and KBAs, the application of the mitigation hierarchy, the application of Other Effective Area-based Conservation Measures and Private Protected Areas, and awareness-raising, among other actions.

**(g) Nature and Culture**

1. The post-2020 global biodiversity framework needs to reflect linkages between nature and culture. The connection between culture and nature is a crucial untapped focus for achieving life for humanity in harmony with nature. Human heritage has been built on our roles as actors in functioning and evolving ecosystems. As an example, the number of cultural World Heritage Sites that overlap with Key Biodiversity Areas, is almost the same as the number of natural sites that overlap with KBAS. 10% of the world's linguistic diversity is associated closely with natural World Heritage Sites, even though they account for only 1% of the Earth's surface.
2. Putting culture at the heart of the post-2020 agenda is not only ethically sound, it is also a practical means to support delivery. The priorities need to be discussed, but could include sustaining traditional land stewardship through farming and pastoralism, acceleration of right-based approaches that empower conservation led by indigenous peoples and local communities as well as the connection of nature to the cultural life and experience of the 55% of people who live in urban areas.

**(h) How should the post-2020 global biodiversity framework reflect diverse and multiple perspectives?**

1. See comments in Sections Q(a) through Q(g) above, as well as on science-based targets in general: the post-2020 Mission should be structured in such a way as to allow disaggregation according to opportunities for different sectors and actors to contribute towards its delivery.

**R. Communication and outreach**

***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?***

1. Transformational change requires global discourse and a compelling narrative: *Save Life on Earth Now / tomorrow will be too late.*
2. Effective communication is required both for the development of the post-2020 framework, and for its implementation. A comprehensive communication strategy will be essential to mobilise engagement for support of a strong post-2020 framework. There is a need to raise awareness of all stakeholders of the existence of biodiversity-related targets across the SDGs and precisely how they relate to the subject matter of the Aichi Targets. Such a strategy needs to be rolled out to optimise impact at the many events to take place between now and COP15.
3. The high-level biodiversity Summit of Heads of State/ Heads of government scheduled for September 2020 should address the need to reinforce the biodiversity conservation underpinning essential for achievement of the SDGs and the renewal of relevant SDG targets finishing in 2020 and raise the level of political support for the development and implementation of the post-2020 framework.

4. Maximum use should be made of the UN Secretary General's Climate Summit in September 2019 to emphasise the close links between combatting climate change and conserving biodiversity.
5. In addition, the post-2020 global biodiversity framework should include a comprehensive communications strategy, tools and resources, for use by Parties and other stakeholders.
6. IUCN believes that the importance of the post-2020 process should be brought to policymakers, businesses, civil society, youth and the public through a simple message: "If we do not come together as a global community to establish an ambitious framework to protect nature after 2020, we risk losing the planet". Biodiversity communications should aim to generate a global discourse on the importance of nature conservation, creating a public movement of support to nature conservation. We have seen a seismic shift in public and institutional engagement in climate change – we need to ensure that nature is regarded in the same way.
7. Generating a global discourse and movement requires a compelling narrative that communicates the extent of biodiversity loss, the impacts of loss and the urgent action needed. This narrative needs to be framed with hope and provide avenues for individuals to act. The process to create a global movement includes at least three steps:
  - Creating a "Paris-like" moment for nature: In spite of the evidence of the extent of biodiversity loss and its effects, there is a lack of broad-based action and a lack of awareness by most people of the importance of biodiversity to their well-being. Reasons for this include the lack of a compelling narrative. A compelling narrative could be the basis for meaningful action-oriented discourse that could galvanize attitudes, transform behaviour and inspire meaningful change. The IUCN World Conservation Congress in June 2020 in France, and CBD COP15 – if utilized effectively – offer a significant opportunity to enhance this movement.
  - Creating a coordinated ecosystem of campaigns: Many organizations and campaigns are working to raise awareness on the importance of establishing a post-2020 global biodiversity framework. IUCN and many others are natural partners in supporting the CBD in creating a more coherent suite of communication and outreach campaigns for the post-2020 process. However, movement building demands consistency and clarity. The overall movement building exercise will be more successful if existing campaigns are softly coordinated and enhanced through a common set of messages shared by all to create one consistent and compelling narrative.
  - Elements of a compelling narrative for nature: A process needs to be instituted immediately by the CBD to help create this compelling and consistent narrative. IUCN, given its dedicated Commission on Education and Communication, is well positioned and willing to support the CBD in this important work.