

# BirdLife International

## Response to the post-2020 global biodiversity framework discussion document

15 April 2019

The following is a summary of BirdLife International's positions on the questions that have been posed in the CBD Secretariat's [discussion document](#) regarding development of the global post-2020 biodiversity framework. The input presented here has been generated by consulting with our scientists and policy experts across the BirdLife International Secretariat and our more than 120 national NGO Partners worldwide.

### Summary

- **Structure of the post-2020 biodiversity framework** - The current framework should be reorganised into a more clear, logical structure that maps a pathway to transformational change; we propose a pyramid structure to help illustrate the interdependence of different sorts of targets within this framework.
- The structure should include targets for enabling mechanisms (such as good governance and financing) that need to be in place to support and enable the achievement of actions (e.g. conserving important sites for biodiversity) that lead to sought after biodiversity outcomes (e.g. reversing biodiversity declines).
- **Ambition of the post-2020 biodiversity framework** - Ambition should be in line with the effort required to halt the loss of biodiversity and see signs of recovery by 2030, in line with our proposed 2030 mission and the current 2050 Vision. Significant political and public momentum is needed for this.
- **Mission** - BirdLife proposes that the 2030 mission could be: **Put nature on a path to recovery by 2030 for the benefit of people and the planet by halting biodiversity loss and reversing declines.**
- BirdLife suggests possible indicators to measure delivery of this mission (e.g. those proposed in Mace et al. 2018) as well as the post-2020 targets.
- **Biodiversity Targets** - The post-2020 targets should be SMART, science-based and focus on similar themes to the 2011-2020 Strategic Plan, with language further refined and gaps addressed, using lessons learned.
- The post-2020 targets should be reflected in, and draw from, processes such as the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) and other conventions such as the UNFCCC - one example could be mapping where biodiversity can be integrated into Nationally Determined Contributions and climate action plans (e.g. by integrating nature-based solutions).
- BirdLife has provided some suggestions for post-2020 targets in Annex I of this document, though we are still developing these. One suggestion is to include as part of an updated spatial conservation target, a focus on ensuring that all Key Biodiversity Areas and other sites of global significance for biodiversity are documented, retained and restored through protected areas and other effective area-based conservation measures.
- **Voluntary commitments and contributions** - BirdLife supports the concept of Parties and other stakeholders such as the private sector and civil society putting forward voluntary biodiversity commitments in advance of 2020. We recognise the value of this as an ambition-raising exercise in initiating and implementing biodiversity conservation activities, as requested in the Sharm el Sheikh Declaration.
- **Mainstreaming** - Increased private sector engagement in the post-2020 framework is needed, including for the championing of key targets. This relates to implementing the Sharm el Sheikh to Kunming Action Agenda.
- A target or targets focused on reducing direct and indirect pressures on biodiversity through mainstreaming of biodiversity in various sectors should be considered for the post-2020 framework.
- **Indicators** - BirdLife strongly supports that the post-2020 targets should be developed at the same time as, and their approval be dependent upon, robust and possibly concomitant indicators being defined.
- **Implementation / review process** - There should be a common format for NBSAPs (e.g. a template), to allow assessment of progress and reporting on implementing the post-2020 targets - this will assist with increased transparency and accountability. National targets should be able to be 'added up' to the global level and global indicators disaggregated to the national level, as part of an improved monitoring and evaluation system. If a subset of more frequently auditable targets were devised, progress could be independently tracked on an annual basis for example rather than being restricted to the cycles of national reports.

- **Resource mobilization / financial mechanisms** - It is very important that a finance/resource mobilisation strategy be developed across all targets and agreed at the same time as the post-2020 biodiversity framework.
- **Communication** - A clear communication strategy should be developed and tailored to specific target audiences at local, national, regional and global levels, making clear asks of Parties and other stakeholders to implement the new framework.

## Detailed comments

Below we provide our position in detail on the various questions posed by the CBD Secretariat's discussion document.

### 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?**

- BirdLife proposes that the current framework be reorganised into a much clearer, logical structure that conveys a 'theory of change', better clarifying the relationship between targets and mapping a pathway to transformational change. One example of a possible schematic for this type of structure was submitted by a consortium of NGOs including BirdLife International in December 2018<sup>1</sup>, with the concept continuing to be further discussed and refined.
- The structure of the post-2020 biodiversity framework needs to be coherent and simple so that it will be easy to communicate.
- Some targets, elements of targets or mechanisms could address enabling conditions that are critically needed and foundational for the post-2020 biodiversity framework. These would cover concepts such as good governance, public and private financing (resource mobilisation), capacity building, communication, partnerships and empowerment (Article 8j).
- Actions or action targets are then needed, in particular to address all direct pressures on (drivers of) biodiversity loss. These actions could be carried out through implementing strategies to elicit change including management plans, for example to tackle threats such as invasive species, to ensure sustainability, e.g. of fisheries as part of a broader target to maintain marine biodiversity and conserving important sites for biodiversity through an expanded and strengthened network of protected areas and other effective area-based conservation measures. The best science available should inform what the pressures are on biodiversity and their extent and therefore what actions are needed.
- There could also be conservation outcomes or outcome targets that outline the state of biodiversity desired for 2030 and 2050 (and clearly define success) in a specific and quantified way, to be scalable at global and national levels. For example, this could include an updated version of Aichi Target 12 that focuses on reversing species declines (e.g. measured via species extinction threat, species population trends and terrestrial biotic integrity). These will need to have associated indicators (indicators closely aligned with outcomes) that could be applied nationally, regionally and globally, and have milestones for 2030.
- The structure of the framework should reflect the three objectives of the convention.

### 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?**

- Biodiversity is in crisis - the evidence for this has never been clearer from recent reports such as the IPBES regional and thematic assessments on biodiversity and ecosystem services, the Global Biodiversity Outlook reports, analyses of national reports<sup>2</sup> and others. The targets we agree upon in 2020 may be one of the last opportunities to turn the tide of damage to our environment and ensure a sustainable future for future

<sup>1</sup> <https://www.cbd.int/doc/strategic-plan/Post2020/postsbi/birdlife2.pdf>

<sup>2</sup> [CBD/COP/14/5/Add.2](https://www.cbd.int/doc/strategic-plan/Post2020/postsbi/birdlife2.pdf)

generations. We implore governments to agree to commitments that reflect the scale of the challenge that we face and to set targets that reflect truly transformational levels of ambition.

- Ambition should be in line with the effort required to halt the loss of biodiversity and see signs of recovery, in line with the 2030 mission and 2050 Vision, measured via indicators such as those outlined in Mace et al. 2018.
- We must ensure that global and national targets agreed in 2020 are underpinned by equally ambitious implementation plans to ensure that they are met over the next decade.
- BirdLife believes that significant political and public momentum is needed to develop and implement an ambitious and effective post-2020 biodiversity strategy and encourages Parties, observers and all to work within their networks and beyond to ensure commitment to it at the highest political levels. Both Ministers of Environment and also government leaders should endorse and adopt the post-2020 framework to ensure government buy-in and create a national mandate for protecting biodiversity.
- There is also a need to understand and liaise with the communities most affected by biodiversity loss - mapping who these groups are and reaching out to them will be important in emphasising and communicating the impacts of biodiversity loss on humanity.
- Ambitious should also mean using new and innovative tools and technologies to implement and monitor post-2020 framework commitments of Parties, the private sector and others. This could include innovative reporting mechanisms, online platforms and live updates of initiatives and actions that are implemented in each country, and a standardised Clearing House Mechanism covering all the biodiversity-related conventions which could link to the SDGs.

### 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?**

To be living in harmony with nature, we need to have effectively mitigated and eliminated the harmful pressures and drivers of biodiversity loss such as habitat conversion and overexploitation (through sustainable use, via mainstreaming, benefit-sharing, etc.) so that we see nature’s recovery and are no longer driving the devastating loss of species, habitats, and ecosystem services.

Key actions include:

- Reversing the decline of biodiversity as per the suggested 2030 mission, which is a milestone to achieving the 2050 Vision – more detail on this is in section D.
- Expanding the global network of 16,000 Key Biodiversity Areas (KBAs) and other areas important for biodiversity to include sites of significance for the global persistence of all taxonomic groups and ecosystems, as well as effective conservation of these sites through appropriately located, effectively managed and adequately resourced protected areas and other effective area-based conservation measures. This should include mapping and preserving remaining intact ecosystems (e.g. criterion C for KBAs), to put them beyond industrial and destructive use, recognising the contribution of indigenous peoples and local communities in maintaining them.
- Targeted interventions to recover populations of all threatened species, e.g. via species-specific actions.
- Interventions to assess ecosystems as Vulnerable (VU), Endangered (EN) or Critically Endangered (CR), recognising that recovery to Near Threatened (NT) will take time in some cases, thus milestones to achieving this will be essential.

### D. MISSION

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

- The mission should be simple, quantifiable and functionally the same as an apex target (apex goal, north star, etc.), thus preventing over-complicating the structure of the post-2020 framework.

- BirdLife proposes that the 2030 mission could be: **Put nature on a path to recovery by 2030 for the benefit of people and the planet by halting biodiversity loss and reversing declines**. This emphasises and starts with the more widely understood term *nature* and the positive term *recovery*, before qualifying the actions needed in terms of *biodiversity* in order to start to reverse the trends in biodiversity declines.
- The mission should be focused on 1) halting the decline/loss of nature and 2) driving the recovery of nature (as the suggested wording above indicates).
- The mission needs to function as a milestone on a trajectory to achieving the 2050 vision of “living in harmony with nature” – so that we have a way to look beyond 2030.
- The mission must be underpinned by and connected to a clear definition of what its achievement means in practice through: explicit, measurable, nationally comparable, underlying indicators and/or targets.
- Global indicators or metrics to measure the implementation of this mission could be drawn, for example from Mace et al. 2018<sup>3</sup> in terms of:
  - Near-future global losses of species (extinctions) estimated using the Red List Index (RLI)<sup>4</sup>;
  - Trends in the abundance of wild species reflected by population-level indicators such as the Living Planet Index (LPI)<sup>5</sup>;
  - Changes in terrestrial biotic integrity (the ‘health’ of the biota) monitored globally using an improved version of the Biodiversity Intactness Index (BII)<sup>6</sup>;
- Other indicators, focusing on nature’s contributions to people, could be drawn from the national level, such as:
  - National Environmental Accounts or similar that measure trajectories.

The mission should not:

- Be focused on protected area extent; while recognising that protected areas are a crucial tool for achieving the mission and Vision, they are not the overarching outcome that the post-2020 framework should aim to achieve;
- Be long, qualitative, and descriptive as the current 2020 mission currently is;
- Just reflect, or be a rewording of, the equivalent missions for 2010 and 2020 to “halt the loss of biodiversity”.

## E. BIODIVERSITY TARGETS

BirdLife has provided some suggestions for post-2020 targets in Annex I of this document, though we are still developing these.

### Question: (a) What do “SMART” targets mean in practical terms?

- SMART targets – meaning specific, measurable, achievable, relevant, and time-bound – should be action- and results-oriented to address the drivers of biodiversity loss.
- Targets for the post-2020 framework should be SMART in a way that promotes scalability to the national level, so that countries can easily interpret and implement them. The less SMART a target is, the more difficult it is to determine national-level contributions towards it and measure progress. Without SMART targets, improvements to national reports and National Biodiversity Strategies and Action Plans (NBSAPs) and the overall accountability of the framework are more difficult to achieve.
- The 2010 targets were very direct, in only addressing biodiversity, while the Aichi Targets were designed to better address the root causes of biodiversity loss as well. We should review and learn lessons from these processes to ensure improvements in the post-2020 framework.
- There should not be a large number or more targets than the Aichi Targets – the number should be kept low to keep understanding and reporting manageable.

<sup>3</sup> Mace et al. (2018). Aiming higher to bend the curve of biodiversity loss. *Nature Sustainability* DOI: [10.1038/s41893-018-0130-0](https://doi.org/10.1038/s41893-018-0130-0)

<sup>4</sup> Butchart et al. (2007) Improvements to the Red List Index. *PLOS ONE* 2(1) <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0000140>

<sup>5</sup> McRae et al. (2017) The Diversity-Weighted Living Planet Index: Controlling for Taxonomic Bias in a Global Biodiversity Indicator. *PLOS ONE* 12(1) <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0169156>

<sup>6</sup> Newbold et al. (2016) Has land use pushed terrestrial biodiversity beyond the planetary boundary? A global assessment, *Science*, 353(6296), 288–291, [doi:10.1126/science.aaf2201](https://doi.org/10.1126/science.aaf2201)

- BirdLife believes that the post-2020 targets should be science and evidence-based and focus on similar themes to the 2011-2020 Strategic Plan and Aichi Targets, for example on conserving important sites for biodiversity through protected areas and Other Effective Conservation Measures (OECMs), preventing extinctions, maintaining ecosystem services, mainstreaming biodiversity into key sectors and tackling the drivers of biodiversity loss. However, many targets could be refined and simplified to better separate them into enabling conditions, actions and outcomes, which are sometimes mixed up in a single Aichi Target. Critically, the post-2020 framework should be focused on better implementation of the targets with successful achievement of milestones as well as more ambitious targets and new concepts where needed.

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

- Lessons learned from the 2011-2020 Strategic Plan and Aichi Biodiversity Targets include the recent findings in a study led by RSPB (BirdLife in the UK) that there has been greater progress towards the Targets that are judged to be measurable, realistic, unambiguous and scalable, with some evidence of a relationship between progress and specificity of the target elements<sup>7</sup>. In other words, ‘SMART’ targets may facilitate greater progress. This builds on earlier work led by BirdLife suggesting that the lack of clarity in the way many targets are articulated (i.e. ambiguity, complexity, and redundancy in the wording, and lack of quantifiability) make it difficult to operationalise the targets, ensure consistent interpretation by Parties, and to quantify progress<sup>8</sup>. At the very least, SMART targets enable better monitoring of progress for targets.
- Aichi Target 11 in particular has received considerable attention, partially attributed to the central role in conservation that protected areas play, though there are other factors that may have contributed including the availability of global datasets to set priorities and measure progress and the clear mandate of Ministries of Environment over protected areas. However, as outlined in a recent paper<sup>9</sup>, there have been some issues with the target:
  1. Focusing on % area coverage can potentially generate perverse incentives, with many new PAs being established in locations that are disproportionately less important for biodiversity.
  2. Many PAs are inadequately managed (e.g. conservation not enforced) and / or resourced and so do not abate some or all of the threats to their biodiversity (in addition to there being different categories of protection) – they are “paper parks” but still count towards achievement of the target.
  3. Target 11 calls for protected area networks to be ‘representative’ and guidance suggests this should be at the scale of ecoregions. But increasing ecoregional representation does not necessarily equate to increasing species representation (unless focused on Key Biodiversity Areas for example) because ecoregions are too broad to capture variability in species composition and endemism, as well as other core elements of biodiversity such as genetic variation and ecological and evolutionary processes.
  4. It isn’t explicit how to interpret the target at the national or subnational level - applying a universal percentage across nations would be inappropriate in light of the unequal distribution of biodiversity and of the area-based conservation needed to protect it. Thus targets and indicators should be explicitly quantified at the national scale so that national contributions can be summed to assess the total global ambition and achievement.
- This also builds on discussions held at a two-day international symposium in London in February 2018 on ‘Safeguarding space for nature, securing our future: developing a post-2020 strategy’<sup>10</sup> organised by BirdLife with the Secretariat of the CBD, IUCN, National Geographic Society, UNEP-WCMC and the Zoological Society of

<sup>7</sup> Green et al. (2019) Relating characteristics of global biodiversity targets to reported progress *Conserv. Biol.*

<https://doi.org/10.1111/cobi.13322>

<sup>8</sup> Butchart et al. (2016) Formulating smart commitments on biodiversity: lessons from the Aichi Targets. *Conserv. Lett.* 9: 457-468

<https://doi.org/10.1111/conl.12278>

<sup>9</sup> Visconti et al. (2019) Protected area targets post-2020. *Science* DOI: [10.1126/science.aav6886](https://doi.org/10.1126/science.aav6886)

<sup>10</sup> Safeguarding Space for Nature and Securing our Future: Developing a Post-2020 Strategy: [CBD/COP/14/INF/25](https://www.cbd.int/doc/2018/02/20180201-01-en.pdf)



London. This symposium reviewed both evidence and options for area-based conservation post-2020 and key messages included that:

1. The current area-based protection target is not adequate in terms of quantity or quality – there is a need to effectively conserve at least 30% of land<sup>11</sup> and sea<sup>12</sup> to conserve biodiversity;
  2. To ensure the conservation of biodiversity, further expansion of protected areas and OECMs should take place in sites important for biodiversity such as Key Biodiversity Areas<sup>13</sup>.
  3. Conserving ecosystem services often requires area-based approaches in locations that are different from those of highest biodiversity significance, with local and global benefits not necessarily in the same place, and more than half the earth's terrestrial area required in order to provide the ecosystem services that people need and currently use. Ensuring the continued and sustainable delivery of ecosystem services through effective conservation of the ecosystems that provide them should be the focus of a specific target in the new framework;
  4. Safeguarding space for nature and for people such as indigenous groups and local communities - who have the right and need to access nature - cannot be addressed in isolation, and depends on people everywhere living more sustainably.
- Aichi Target 12 on preventing extinctions and reversing declines of threatened species has been difficult to achieve because of the range of threats and underlying drivers that need addressing, the complexity and diversity of solutions needed, and the short timeline involved. However, the need to focus on ensuring species conservation by halting species loss and facilitating recovery (improvement in the status) of declining species, is extremely important, as reflected in the proposed 2030 mission. A new post-2020 target should thus focus on how to tackle pressures and drivers of species loss, with robust accountability mechanisms and implementation plans.

**Question: (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?**

- The post-2020 global biodiversity framework needs to support and be integrated into other related conventions and global initiatives including the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development, the Paris Agreement under the UNFCCC (e.g. nature-based solutions for climate change), CMS, CITES, Ramsar Convention, UNCCD, etc. Concrete wording in these other conventions and processes needs to address actions for biodiversity conservation (e.g. reforestation or afforestation for climate change mitigation needs to help with biodiversity and not just carbon sequestration).
- Ideas for the post-2020 biodiversity framework can also be taken from these other processes and conventions, as the framework should be compatible with and complement them. Synergies amongst the conventions should build on existing CBD synergies work<sup>14</sup>, for example coordinated reporting with the other conventions to avoid duplication of work by convention focal points.
- Targets and indicators for the new post-2020 global biodiversity framework should feed into the SDGs via targets SDGs 14 and 15, adding new or updated targets and indicators in particular where they are due to expire in 2020. An explicit reference to the new UN-wide global biodiversity framework could be included under SDGs 14 and 15 to emphasise that delivery of the entire framework is necessary for the successful delivery of the 2030 Agenda on Sustainable Development, in a similar way to the UNFCCC process under SDG 13.
- The post-2020 global biodiversity framework needs to better link with the UNFCCC by, for example, mapping the entry points where biodiversity can be integrated into Nationally Determined Contributions and climate

<sup>11</sup> Butchart et al. (2015) Shortfalls and Solutions for Meeting National and Global Conservation Area Targets. *Conserv Lett.* 8: 329–337. Venter et al. (2014) Targeting Global Protected Area Expansion for Imperiled Biodiversity. *PLoS Biol.* 12.

<https://doi.org/10.1111/conl.12158>

<sup>12</sup> O'Leary et al. (2016) 'Effective coverage targets for ocean protection' *Conserv. Lett.* <https://doi.org/10.1111/conl.12247>

<sup>13</sup> [www.keybiodiversityareas.org](http://www.keybiodiversityareas.org)

<sup>14</sup> Supporting The Implementation Of Decision XIII/24 Of The Conference Of The Parties CBD/SBI/2/INF/13

action plans (e.g. by integrating nature-based solutions<sup>15</sup> and safeguards and associated tools for planning renewable infrastructure such as soaring bird sensitivity mapping for wind turbines). This will also help to enhance synergies for biodiversity planning and development planning on a national level.

## 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?**

- BirdLife supports the concept of Parties and other stakeholders such as the private sector and civil society putting forward voluntary biodiversity commitments in advance of 2020. We recognise the value of this as an ambition-raising exercise in initiating and implementing biodiversity conservation activities, as requested in the Sharm el Sheikh Declaration.
- These commitments could be akin to “pledges” that can be made nationally relevant. They should be additional to the NBSAP process and not a replacement for it. They should not pre-determine the content of the post-2020 framework but would assist in communicating and inspiring national action and ambition, as well as show-casing what leadership different countries can offer for the post-2020 biodiversity framework.
- Another benefit of national commitments is that they allow Parties to take ‘ownership’ over an issue that might be particularly nationally relevant and ensure action towards it.
- To ensure accountability and that commitments are not ‘hollow’, a process should be considered for incorporating commitments made by Parties and others into NBSAPs and other national and sub-national planning processes.
- Another consideration could be having a central place to register voluntary commitments in a standardised format, also enabling a ‘rewards’ system such as through tax incentives, etc.

## G. RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN THE POST-2020 GLOBAL BIODIVERSITY FRAMEWORK AND OTHER RELEVANT PROCESSES

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

- Many enabling conditions and actions for the post-2020 biodiversity framework cannot be adequately delivered through the CBD and environmental ministries alone and will require either inter-ministerial or whole-of-government approaches as well as wider societal efforts and collaboration with other conventions and policy mechanisms. Heads of government in particular being aware of and signing on to the post-2020 biodiversity framework as opposed to only environment ministers for example could assist this.
- Thus the post-2020 global biodiversity framework needs to support and be integrated into other related conventions and global initiatives including the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development, the Paris Agreement under the UNFCCC, CMS, CITES, UNCCD, Ramsar Convention, etc. A review of these synergies should be undertaken and a systematic process developed to ensure that there is integration between them.
- Ideas for the content of the post-2020 framework and its targets, as well as best practices regarding implementation, can also be drawn from these other conventions and processes.
- Information should be taken from CBD-authored documents as well, such as CBD/COP/14/INF/2 on enhancing synergies among biodiversity-related conventions (<https://www.cbd.int/doc/c/4fc5/ef6a/582e0ee9df8281a7a9d13b8b/cop-14-inf-02-en.pdf>)
- One idea to avoid duplication and ensure coherence and comprehensiveness would be for key targets from related conventions to be ‘copied across’ into the post-2020 framework, and for key targets from the post-2020 framework – or the entire framework, as proposed in section E(c) – to be cross-referenced within the SDG framework, to ensure synergies and coordination between all these processes.

<sup>15</sup> WWF. 2017. NDCs – a force for nature?

## H. MAINSTREAMING

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

- Increased private sector engagement in the post-2020 framework is needed, including for the championing of key targets. This relates to implementing the Sharm el Sheikh to Kunming Action Agenda and maximising other opportunities for engagement on post-2020 such as through the World Economic Forum and the Global Partnership for Business and Biodiversity.
- Mechanisms to facilitate the mainstreaming of biodiversity in both government and private sector practices, creating a change from 'business as usual', need to be encapsulated in the post-2020 biodiversity framework, such as through the targets but also other approaches.
- A target or targets focused on reducing direct and indirect pressures on biodiversity through mainstreaming of biodiversity in other sectors should be considered for the post-2020 framework. This would include embedding consideration of biodiversity, ecological processes and conservation of sites into economic and development planning as well as integrating and mainstreaming biodiversity into sector policies. Implementation should be at the land/seascape, range-wide or flyway-scales. This will be in conjunction with other conventions or policy processes, such as the SDGs (as for current Aichi Target 4 and SDG 12, SDG13).
- BirdLife supports the concept of Parties and also other stakeholders such as the private sector and civil society putting forward voluntary biodiversity contributions for the post-2020 biodiversity framework in advance of 2020, and beyond. This could be supported by a communications platform show-casing contributions and progress towards the implementation of targets.
- Other ideas to functionalise mainstreaming include the CBD elaborating roadmaps to work with the private sector and establishing MOUs with other fora (e.g. other conventions, institutions such as the FAO, etc) specifically incorporating the delivery of the new agreed framework.

## 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?**

- See additional information in section E regarding the Aichi Targets.
- Updated / new targets would benefit from clearer definition of what mechanisms exist to facilitate their implementation and, at the national level, clearer definition of roles and responsibilities for their implementation in terms of who / which groups lead on their implementation and through what mechanisms.
- Setting achievable and time-bound milestones could ensure that measurable progress to conserve biodiversity can be made. The post-2020 framework needs to look beyond 2030 and be part of a longer pathway to change with consistent and transparent monitoring, reporting and accountability. A key issue with the current framework is that there was a limited window for implementation with 2020 being seen as a firm deadline for a new process or vision to be agreed - we need to move beyond this and see 2030 as a major point of review of effectiveness, not as the "end" of a decade.
- Indicators should exist for each target and be functional at the time that the target is established. There have been substantial improvements in the development of global indicator frameworks in recent years so that it will be possible to build on this and move much quicker into implementation.
- Lessons should be learned from the documents that have reviewed implementation of the Aichi Targets, for example as reflected in decision CBD/COP/DEC/14/1 (<https://www.cbd.int/doc/decisions/cop-14/cop-14-dec-01-en.pdf>), and in information documents as well such as CBD/COP/14/INF/1 on mainstreaming (<https://www.cbd.int/doc/c/34e0/dce3/6019a9fbff6571e0318e60bf/cop-14-inf-01-en.pdf>).
- Alongside carefully designed and ambitious targets, there needs to be significant additional thought on improving the implementation mechanisms for the post-2020 agenda. This includes (but is not limited to) the accountability and transparency in reporting on the framework, especially through indicators and, at the national level, through reporting processes such as NBSAPs. This also includes considering other ways to improve



accountability through a compliance mechanism, peer review or other processes – we need to learn from what works in other contexts. We suggest that a thematic group for example could be established to explore this in more detail.

## K. INDICATORS

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

- BirdLife strongly supports that the post-2020 targets should be developed at the same time as, and their approval be dependent upon, robust<sup>16</sup> and possibly concomitant<sup>17</sup> indicators being defined. These indicators should be currently available or feasible to develop within a short timeframe.
- Indicators should link directly to targets.
- BirdLife recommends drawing on the IPBES global assessment, due to be published in May 2019 with a chapter co-authored by BirdLife's Chief Scientist, which represents a synthesis of best-available science to identify specific indicators for each proposed target.
- Particular focus should be on those indicators that can be disaggregated to produce metrics relevant to multiple targets, such as the Red List Index.
- Focus should also be given to indicators that can be implemented at the national level, thus also helping to improve national accountability.
- Indicators should be based on data that can be measured at regular intervals (ideally annually) at the national level to enable rapid and objective assessment of progress – this will help not only with reporting but also decision-making (overcoming decision-making based on data deficiencies). One example could be KBA pressure, state and response monitoring. Capacity building and resource mobilisation needs should be identified at the same time as targets and indicators are developed to determine where countries will need support for implementing them. The idea of a developing a subset of independently verifiable indicators that can be tracked annually and used to gauge progress globally could also be explored.
- Where possible and relevant, data and information for indicators could be drawn from other processes and conventions – e.g. the CMS Illegal Killing of Birds scoreboard.

## L. IMPLEMENTATION AND NBSAPS

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

- Many Parties have put substantial effort into developing and revising their NBSAPs - the primary vehicle for biodiversity conservation planning and implementation. However, currently it is extremely difficult to compare national strategies and reports and therefore determine whether actions are sufficiently (collectively) addressing the commitments in the global framework.
- There should be a set of common requirements for the format and substance of NBSAPs (e.g. a template), which is prescriptive enough to allow national-level accountability for actions (quantifying contributions to meeting global targets) but also to retain some flexibility for national circumstances.
- There will need to be some analysis of revisions of NBSAPs after the post-2020 framework is agreed to re-align national plans with global ambition and the new targets. This will be the best opportunity to implement templates for NBSAPs and ensure that consistency and comparability is built in.
- The post-2020 framework should help to facilitate better engagement between those leading on its implementation and other government / private sector work, such as through providing CBD National Focal Points with the principles and tools for this engagement.

<sup>16</sup> [Joppa et al. \(2016\) Filling in Biodiversity Threat Gaps. Science Translational Medicine.](#)

<sup>17</sup> [Sparks et al. \(2011\). Linked indicator sets for addressing biodiversity loss. Oryx, 45\(3\), 411-419](#)

- Mechanisms for implementing NBSAPs on the ground need to be clearly identified, tracked and monitored, such as strategic and multi-stakeholder land / marine planning processes and their associated outcomes – this multi-stakeholder approach will assist with support for NBSAPs as well.
- A process or template of minimum requirements should be considered for incorporating contributions made by Parties and others such as the private sector and organisations into NBSAPs and other national and sub-national planning processes.
- Information on lessons learned regarding implementation should also be drawn from CBD documents such as CBD/COP/14/5/Add.1 (<https://www.cbd.int/doc/c/3d50/c310/2e8a0f5f3b44fd8c0df5f7f3/cop-14-05-add1-en.pdf>) and CBD/COP/14/5/Add.2 (<https://www.cbd.int/doc/c/7c28/274f/338c8e84ad6f03bf9636dcbf/cop-14-05-add2-en.pdf>).
- There should be a mechanism to share successful conservation action and instruments amongst Parties.
- Concrete national progress indicators (as per above) are needed to improve accountability. These would require provision of data such as changes in the number of CR/EN/VU species and their trajectories in terms of improvements or declines.
- NBSAPs should also include and report on not just government progress but also that of other stakeholders such as the private sector, organisations and individuals in implementing the targets (e.g. through a self-referral reporting process).

## 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?**

- BirdLife feels that it is very important that a finance/resource mobilisation strategy be developed across all targets and agreed at the same time as the post-2020 biodiversity framework.
- BirdLife suggests the resource mobilisation framework addresses the need for increased investments from all sources towards biodiversity conservation and ecosystem services to avoid further loss and as a way to secure livelihoods, reduce poverty and foster sustainable development.
- Resourcing budgets could be required for achieving targets in NBSAPs.
- A resource mobilisation framework should:
  1. Address actions to enhance resource mobilisation from all sources. Countries should urgently increase investments from all sources towards biodiversity conservation and ecosystem services. For that purpose, actions include estimates of funding needs and gaps.
  2. Secure international financial flows to developing countries and target setting. Expenditures should be transparent in order to track progress of resource mobilisation targets to be established.
  3. Allow countries to set commitments for including biodiversity in national priorities and development plans, including through natural capital accounting and incorporating this into national accounts. There will be a need that Parties change the ways in which resources are allocated in economies, including national budgets. Moreover, additional resources should be mobilised through various biodiversity financing mechanisms (BFM) and guidelines for BFM safeguards should be adopted.
  4. Include monitoring of domestic spending, gaps and needs, with a reporting mechanism.
  5. Enhance capacity for efficient use of funding which would envisage countries are well positioned to access, absorb and make use of increased funding flows. For that purpose, it is fundamental that in-country institutional frameworks, including cross-sectoral planning and coordination mechanisms, be strengthened. Additionally, an appropriate governance structure to efficiently allocate and spend funding should support enhanced transparency and accountability of financial flows.
  6. The post-2020 framework should include a target similar to Aichi Target 3 to eliminate subsidies that are harmful to nature and nature's contributions to people, which should link to the SDGs (e.g. SDG Target 12C).

## N. FINANCIAL MECHANISMS

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

- GEF projects should be aligned with the post-2020 targets and should show how each project directly supports Parties in achieving the new framework, including to specific indicators where relevant.
- National plans with budgets for the next year should be submitted, with a GEF working group to assess NBSAPs for identifying priorities over the next year, leading to an 'agreed priorities' approach.
- Competitive grants targeting community groups, local people, civil society should be considered.
- Micro-finance schemes to allow government matching for smaller scale national projects should be considered.
- GEF projects should be aligned with the new targets and should show how each project directly contributes and supports Parties in achieving the goals of the new framework, including to specific indicators where relevant.
- An endowment fund whose interest would allow for implementation of actions determined by a competitive grants process could be a possibility? This could also be a valuable model for national funding models of biodiversity conservation.

## 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?**

- The current national reporting process for the 2011-2020 Strategic Plan and Aichi Targets is a key part of an implementation mechanism for the post-2020 biodiversity framework, but the format and data requirements for national reporting are not comparable and promote opacity of actions.
- An improved monitoring and evaluation system should be put in place for the post-2020 biodiversity framework, with improved transparency and accountability through cycles of reporting on progress and plans (e.g. standardised national reports being published online and searchable).
- National or subnational targets should be able to be 'added up' to the global level and, similarly, global indicators able to be disaggregated to the national level.
- National reports should contain standardised reporting of core indicators against targets.
- This more consistent and transparent national reporting framework would only be effective if combined with an improved NBSAP template that is standardised in format and require SMART global targets to be translated into national targets (and therefore reported on).
- NBSAPs and national reports should also be able to accommodate the achievements of other conventions and processes that Parties are signatory to, as well as activities by NGOs and the private sector.

## P. RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN THE CONVENTION AND THE PROTOCOLS

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

BirdLife does not have a position on this at this time.

## Q. INTEGRATING DIVERSE PERSPECTIVES

**Questions: 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? How should gender issues be reflected in the scope and content of the post2020 global biodiversity framework? Question: How should issues related to subnational governments, cities and other local authorities be reflected in the scope and content of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework? How can the post2020 global biodiversity framework facilitate the involvement of civil society in the development and implementation of the framework? How can the**

**post-2020 global biodiversity framework facilitate the involvement of youth in the development and implementation of the framework? 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? How should the post-2020 global biodiversity framework reflect diverse and multiple perspectives?**

- Recognition and incorporation of benefits to and contributions of local people and indigenous peoples to the development of the post-2020 biodiversity framework, its implementation and conservation of biodiversity is critical.
- The wider involvement of civil society, in particular conservation NGOs and academia, should be recognised and incorporated where possible through multi-stakeholder processes at the national and international level to strengthen cross-sectoral collaboration with successful examples taken from other conventions and multi-stakeholder processes. Examples include the Convention on Migratory Species' Energy Task Force, which BirdLife coordinates, and our GEF-funded Migratory Soaring Birds Project working across sectors and stakeholders in 11 countries along the Red Sea-Rift Valley flyway.
- A considerable challenge to biodiversity conservation in many developing countries is when 'human interests' are not appropriately factored into conservation strategies. Some SDG objectives have been mentioned as being important for the post-2020 framework but this could be further enhanced especially if the interests/preservation of indigenous communities are considered. Historically and by their very nature, the body of knowledge from these communities have been and continue to be relevant toward achieving the local conservation agenda. A deliberate policy of including indigenous / local experiences as well as adopting a balanced framework that addresses key livelihood options for communities together with the conservation agenda will be sustainable long term.
- Champions willing to support, communicate and implement the post-2020 biodiversity framework need to be sought out across a number of stakeholders / audiences including government, businesses, the finance sector, the public, organisations, local communities and indigenous groups.
- Regional dialogues with varied stakeholders (women, youth, etc) to address challenges, gaps and progress in the biodiversity agenda could contribute to a monitoring / review mechanism.
- Certain basic principles, such as human rights and gender inclusion and rights, could be articulated as underlying principles to the post-2020 framework rather than as stand-alone targets or within separate targets, though indicators could be designed to be disaggregated to different stakeholder groups where feasible.

## **R. COMMUNICATION AND OUTREACH**

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

- A simple, common and compelling narrative about the importance and urgency of biodiversity conservation for the post-2020 framework is fundamental, starting with the 2030 mission and further elucidated through a post-2020 framework communications strategy.
- Communication efforts must go beyond just awareness raising to help mobilise behavioural and transformational change, such as through creating opportunities for civil society to lead more sustainable lives and ultimately engage with the biodiversity conservation process. A clear communications strategy should be developed and tailored to specific target audiences at local, national, regional and global levels, making clear asks of Parties and other stakeholders in order to implement the shared vision and mission of the new framework. This includes emphasising the impacts of biodiversity loss on peoples and communities that directly rely on nature for their livelihoods.
- The Sharm El-Sheikh to Kunming Action Agenda for Nature and People has the potential to catalyse a groundswell of actions from all sectors and stakeholders in support of biodiversity conservation and its sustainable use. We must ensure that the potential for the Action Agenda is capitalised on as much as possible to be proactive and outward facing rather than a passive online platform.

- There is a need to build high-level political engagement in the post-2020 framework development process. BirdLife therefore supports a Heads of State Summit in the margins of the UNGA 2020, though as a stand-alone event it will not be enough to achieve adequate high-level political buy-in. This could build on previous processes such as the IPBES dialogues and will need to act as the public-facing end-point of a more holistic, longer high-level political process, where biodiversity is central to other key global meetings such as the G7, World Economic Forum, and High Level Political Forum on Sustainable Development.

## ANNEX I – SUGGESTIONS TO DATE FOR POST-2020 BIODIVERSITY FRAMEWORK TARGETS

BirdLife has put together the following suggestions to date regarding targets for the post-2020 biodiversity framework.

### Species

- A revised / updated Target 12 should entail preventing species extinctions, recovering threatened species and reversing the decline of wildlife populations: for example, trends in species extinction risk are improving as demonstrated by the Red List Index.
- Wildlife population abundance is recovering with both threatened and common species population declines halted and recovering, for example as shown by the Living Planet Index, the Wild Bird Index and the Biodiversity Intactness Index (BII).
- Implementation of a target focusing on preventing extinctions and recovering threatened species could be through development and implementation of species conservation action plans, strategic planning to avoid wildlife conflicts or addressing illegal/unsustainable killing and trade of wildlife.
- The post-2020 framework needs to address the major threats to species including unsustainable production systems driving habitat loss, invasive alien species, pollution and large-scale extinctions of prey such as invertebrates. It also needs to give much greater attention to climate change (including the need for targeted actions to help species to adapt) as well as unsustainable hunting and collecting of species, and unintentional killing (e.g. such as by-catch). Clear and measurable approaches to monitoring these efforts also needs to be implemented.
- The post-2020 framework could expand on Sustainable Development Goal 15.7, which states: “Take urgent action to end poaching and trafficking of protected species of flora and fauna and address both demand and supply of illegal wildlife products” by supporting sustainable, traditional use and subsistence hunting of species.

### Ecosystems

- Intact ecosystems maintained: The extent and condition of intact natural ecosystems are identified (e.g. using KBA Criterion C) and are stabilised or increasing.
- Degraded ecosystems are restored to maintain and improve biological and ecological function and the provisioning of ecosystem services such as food, clean water, clean air.

### Connectivity

- A new target or elements of other targets should focus on maintaining and ensuring connectivity between areas important for and being managed for biodiversity and ecosystem services, to encourage movement of species, connected habitats and refugia given climate change. This could be facilitated via spatial planning and development activities at land/seascape, range-wide or flyway-scale.



## Spatial conservation

- A global standard for defining Key Biodiversity Areas (KBAs) was recently published<sup>18</sup> and specifies how sites can qualify as KBAs under quantitative criteria relating to threatened species and ecosystems, geographically restricted species and ecosystems, ecological integrity, biological processes (such as aggregations), and irreplaceability.
- It will be essential to ensure the conservation of Key Biodiversity Areas and other sites of global significance for biodiversity in the post-2020 framework, as per the Information Document 37<sup>19</sup> that was submitted at SBSTTA 22 in July 2018.
- As mentioned in section E on biodiversity targets, a recent paper<sup>20</sup> and work from a 2018 symposium<sup>21</sup> have identified several problems with Aichi Target 11 that need to be addressed in the post-2020 biodiversity framework.
- To address these issues, the paper proposed some new wording for the post-2020 target, building on Aichi Target 11: “The value of all sites of global significance for biodiversity, including key biodiversity areas, is documented, retained, and restored through protected areas and other effective area-based conservation measures (OECMs).” The rationale for identifying and effectively conserving all sites of importance for biodiversity is provided by the recent paper by Visconti et al. (2019)<sup>22</sup>.
- Biodiversity value refers to all biodiversity elements (populations, ecosystems, and ecological processes) in a site that have been identified as being of global biodiversity importance, which must be kept in favourable conservation status. This wording focuses on the specific locations (actual or potentially manageable units) identified as important for the persistence of biodiversity.
- To retain and restore their biodiversity value, these networks will need to be effectively and equitably managed, ecologically representative, well connected and appropriately located.
- The proposed wording doesn’t haven’t the shortcomings identified for the current Target 11. For example, this could not be achieved if countries fail to place protected areas in the most appropriate locations for biodiversity, or if they fail to resource or secure protected areas adequately. It isn’t prescriptive about the policies and actions required: any form of governance or management that provides clearly defined biodiversity outcomes would contribute, with progress assessed at any geographic and administrative level.
- While there is already considerable momentum behind efforts to set a higher percentage area threshold for protected area networks by 2030, it is critical that protected areas are appropriately located and effectively managed. The Key Biodiversity Area network<sup>23</sup> can readily be used by governments to identify additional critical locations for expanding or designating new protected areas, and monitoring their effectiveness in conserving biodiversity, though further work needs to be done for marine areas and for some taxonomic groups such as invertebrates and plants.
- Other effective area-based conservation measures (OECMs) referred to in Aichi Target 11 appear to also play an important role in conserving Key Biodiversity Areas outside of protected areas, and speak to what ‘living in

<sup>18</sup> IUCN (2016) [A Global Standard for the Identification of Key Biodiversity Areas](#), Version 1.0. IUCN, Gland, Switzerland.

<sup>19</sup> Key Biodiversity Areas and biodiversity conservation targets:

<https://www.cbd.int/doc/c/f608/8caf/71b9bcd5f00870cc5cf39b66/sbstta-22-inf-37-en.pdf>

<sup>20</sup> Visconti et al. (2019) Protected area targets post-2020. *Science* DOI: [10.1126/science.aav6886](https://doi.org/10.1126/science.aav6886)

<sup>21</sup> Safeguarding Space for Nature and Securing our Future: Developing a Post-2020 Strategy: [CBD/COP/14/INF/25](#)

<sup>22</sup> Visconti et al. (2019) Protected area targets post-2020. *Science* DOI: [10.1126/science.aav6886](https://doi.org/10.1126/science.aav6886)

<sup>23</sup> BirdLife International (2019) *World Database of Key Biodiversity Areas*. Developed by the KBA Partnership: BirdLife International, International Union for the Conservation of Nature, Amphibian Survival Alliance, Conservation International, Critical Ecosystem Partnership Fund, Global Environment Facility, Global Wildlife Conservation, NatureServe, Rainforest Trust, Royal Society for the Protection of Birds, Wildlife Conservation Society and World Wildlife Fund. March 2019 version. Available at: <http://www.keybiodiversityareas.org/site/search>.

harmony with nature' entails. A recent analysis<sup>24</sup> assembled data from ten countries on the occurrence of potential OECMs in terrestrial Key Biodiversity Areas (KBAs) outside of protected areas. Three-quarters of the KBAs assessed were at least partly covered by potential OECMs, with OECMs considered preferable to protected area designation in over half of KBAs currently lacking both. These findings suggest that the majority of unprotected KBAs could be covered by OECMs, emphasising that 'conserved areas' should be retained alongside protected areas in the wording of a post-2020 area-based target, but further work is needed to evaluate and strengthen the effectiveness of OECMs.

### **Sustainable production / mainstreaming of biodiversity**

- Mainstreaming of biodiversity (reducing direct pressures on biodiversity, building for example on the 11 IUCN threat categories ) should be the focus of a set of specific targets. Monitoring of the reduction of threats could be an indicator. Embedding conservation of sites, species and ecological processes into economic and development planning, policies and implementation at land/seascape, range-wide or flyway-scales should be a focus.
- A new target to sustainably manage areas of the planet not protected or being managed for conservation of biodiversity, supported by sustainable production and consumption (including the integration of biodiversity considerations throughout the supply or value chain through mainstreaming actions) and the equitable distribution of resources, should be another focus. Production areas should be designed and managed to maintain and support and not lose biodiversity. This should be in conjunction with other conventions or policy processes, such as the Sustainable Development Goals (e.g. more explicitly linking the replacement for current Aichi Target 4 with SDG 12).

### **Climate change**

- There should be better consideration of climate change in the new framework (e.g. nature-based solutions for adaptation and mitigation including forests and blue carbon, as well as incorporating climate change adaptation into species conservation efforts).

### **Enabling conditions**

- Conditions such as good governance, public and private financing (resource mobilisation), capacity building, communications, partnerships and empowerment (Article 8j) need to be in place to ensure the implementation of the post-2020 biodiversity framework. These could be the focus of a particular target or set of targets.

**BirdLife International is the world's largest conservation partnership, with 120 national Partners, and the pre-eminent international authority on bird conservation.**

For more information, visit [www.birdlife.org](http://www.birdlife.org) or contact:

Melanie Heath, Director of Science Policy and Information, +44 (0) 7796 130394, [melanie.heath@birdlife.org](mailto:melanie.heath@birdlife.org)

Dr Noëlle Kumpel, Head of Policy, +44 (0) 7989 036901, [noelle.kumpel@birdlife.org](mailto:noelle.kumpel@birdlife.org)

Dena Cator, Global Conservation Policy Coordinator, +44 (0) 7934 865969, [dena.cator@birdlife.org](mailto:dena.cator@birdlife.org)

<sup>24</sup> Donald et al. (in review) The prevalence, characteristics and effectiveness of Aichi Target 11's "other effective area-based conservation measures" (OECMs) in Key Biodiversity Areas.