

**UNEP/MAP Task Force inputs on issues and questions for discussion on the post-2020 global biodiversity framework**

The CBD Secretariat provided the below list of questions linked to a number of issue areas identified. UNEP/MAP presents herein below answers to several among them from its point of view.

**Issues and questions for discussion**

# Structure of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework

What could constitute an effective structure for the post-2020 global biodiversity framework?

An added value of the structure would be to develop it as result-based framework with expected outputs, related impacts and possible outcomes facilitated by them. Existing gaps at the time of the framework preparation should be clearly recorded.

The simplification of the structure as possible would help communication purposes, which in turn are an important component for countries and organisations support to implementation

What should its different elements be, and how should they be organized?

# Ambition of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework

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

"Ambitious" biodiversity framework would mean a framework where "business as usual" cannot be an option to address all the challenges faced by biodiversity conservation.

Redefine targets, make them simple and evident for the countries, define clearly unambiguous indicators and how to measure them, develop guidelines for indicator analysis and evaluation of progress by the countries.

# 2050 Vision for Biodiversity

What, in real terms, does “living in harmony” with nature entail?

Respecting the functional role of ecosystems to maintain life on earth, further to human one, and included its current biodiversity.

Living within the natural limits and respecting the resilience of the planet, as well as continuously restoring affected ecosystems.

The approach for "Living in harmony with nature" should not only require the local population to respect ecosystems, but should enable local populations to do so.

Consider the real value of biodiversity and adjust penalties for its destruction multiplied by the time for its recovery.

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?

Monitor the performance of ecosystem services as well as assessing and restoring as appropriate.

Being the restoration of ecosystems part of the circular economy, particularly address this topic which is often overlooked in comparison to closing loops in terms of use of resources.

Better understand the requirements of the ecosystems (ex: the requirements in water of wetlands in order to take them into consideration in the water resources allocation) and of endangered species.

Review the national legislations and enforcement on biodiversity matters.

# Mission

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

Identify a phase one target on specific indicators (at least baseline)

Complete the identification and way of measurements (and country evaluation mechanisms) of all indicators

# Biodiversity Targets

What does “SMART” targets mean in practical terms?

A target that is clearly reachable independently of its achievement difficulty, and that should include qualitative targets too.

A target that addresses the production and consumption stages, and not only the impacts and effects.

A target that is result based.

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

Maintaining the structure of the goals and Aichi targets could be practical, but improving the fact that targets are from different types and categorisation should be clearly established.

Clarify the processes for monitoring, developping indicators and evaluation systems, countries have usually not enough time to do so.

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?

They should be aligned with global targets from different frameworks until a certain level and adjusted to the national system within specific limits, keeping coherence with the current UN SDGs (as they should be eventually projected beyond 2030), based in current know-how.

Biodiversity BNJ should become a subject for development in the new Framework, as well as addressing eventual transboundary measures regarding State responsibility and liability to preclude endangered spp. and ecosystems extinction on land and at sea.

# 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?

NBSAPs should include, as substantial component, the country voluntary commitments and contributions engaged for their implementation, commitments expected by concrete stakeholders and, eventually, pledges needed for estimated complete fulfilment, including also the most promising ones from private and business actors’ sources. Business actors’ commitment should eventually benefit from review mechanisms.

A similar approach to the one used for the NDC (Nationally Determined contribution) under the UNFCCC should be used. This means that each Party should provide its voluntary commitments regarding the Vision and objectives of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework.

# 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?

Close relationship with the poverty alleviation goals should be ensured with the view of reducing the pressure on the biodiversity resources

Start to review the existing socio-economic models and propose alternatives and options for the future.

And what are the implications for the scope and content of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework?

Helping harmonise targets with other Conventions initiatives, including with Regional Seas Conventions and Agreements for Sea topics.

Build ownership by MEAs through participative elaboration approach, allowing future synergies through complementarities and preclusion of duplication on eventual overlaps.

Promote the signature of the Aarhus Convention, EIA, SEA and other mechanisms.

# Mainstreaming

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

Drivers of threats to biodiversity have economic actors beyond biodiversity. So, development of related regulation is a permanent need, in addition to voluntary commitments. Ministries in charge of environment should be empowered as possible through the framework. NBSAPs as binding instruments should be internationally promoted to be undertaken at national level, after inter-ministerial exchange and agreement, with owed full respect to States sovereignty. Inter-ministerial governance structures to exchange on biodiversity needs, with civil society participation access, should be promoted within States.

General guiding to economies’ stakeholders on positive steps towards biodiversity conservation should be part of the framework, including natural capital topics.

# Relationship with the current Strategic Plan

What are the lessons learned from the implementation of the current Strategic Plan?

Need of strong boosting of coordination at national levels (Ministries) for improved regulation of socio economic policies impacts on biodiversity, and including public consultation and information.

The shortage in accurate data and knowledge about ecosystems, assemblages and species populations was among the main hindrance in achieving the goals of the current Strategic Plan. Further consideration should be given therefore to the programmes of monitoring and data collection.

Integration of all sectors in the biodiversity concerns is needed, which is not the case today, as even land use planning and maritime spatial planning are separated.

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?

Support to transformation of countries’ economies towards strong jobs development reorientation for biodiversity conservation and sustainable resources use, to address needs on fields such as:

Human resources, technical capacity, knowledge and expertise for biodiversity conservation; field infrastructure and equipment. Long term monitoring programmes; improved spatial management (land and the marine ones) through an ecosystem approach and related regular evaluation; environmental legislation development and enforcement, including remote areas and the High Seas.

The requirements in terms of financial resources of the post-2020 framework should be evaluated by each Party from the early stages of implementation and communicated to the Secretariat.

Use of revised legislation enforcement and penalties for financing biodiversity.

# 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?

Legal changes, ecosystem and biodiversity values.

# Implementation and NBSAPs

How can the effectiveness and implementation of the NBSAPs be strengthened?

Need to harmonise guidance to make them more prospective but retaining feasibility.

Link to them a standardised implementation reporting to facilitate comparisons.

Immerse NBSAPs in broader political frame by linking them with countries’ development plans and governments mandates programmes Explicit definition of desired actors and partners for the actions, including ministries other that the one charged for environment, should appear.

NBSAPs need also a link to regional level SAPs, for harmonising regional dimension actions. So, SAPs should be countries commitments with also their intergovernmental commitments to embrace transboundary conservation needs.

Engage a fully participative elaboration approach, allowing also subnational governance structures and civil society to intervene.

NBSAPs regular reviews and updates should be scheduled in their approval documents to avoid them becoming outdated adopted tools.

Regional Strategies and Action Plans should be encouraged. For the marine environment “Regional” means the Regional Seas. The SAP BIO (for biodiversity) and the SAP MED (for pollution) under the Barcelona Convention may be an example.

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?

Clearly include in NBSAPs also their contribution to global and regional goals from/in-addition-to national actions implementation.

Develop collections of guiding tools on SAPs best practises around the world on different thematics.

# Resource mobilization

How should the post-2020 global biodiversity framework address resource mobilization?

A funding strategy for regional character actions should be developed by regions, including an estimation of costs associated to each target. It should include an estimate cost of not doing nothing. The topic of subsidies with negative impact on biodiversity should be addressed through an adaptation strategy towards environmental conservation through positive incentives.

And what implications does this have for the scope and content of the framework?

It needs to include that each Party should elaborate its funding strategy and communicate it to the Secretariat.

# 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?

Regional projects that promote harmonisation and complementarity should be encouraged by GEF, in particular in allowing more involvement of International and Regional organisations in project development and implementation.

Each country to create and environmental fund with funding mechanism, to which GEF would prioritize complementary funding.

# Review process

What additional mechanisms, if any, are required to support the review of implementation of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework?

A review of compliance mechanisms in different Conventions, including when relevant Regional Seas Conventions, should take place to extract proposals for review of implementation at regional level.

And how should these be integrated into the framework?

Compliance mechanisms are soft, they need to be made more binding through the framework.

# Relationship between the Convention and the Protocols

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

A lawyers/planners/scientist think tank is needed to analyse this.

What are the issues associated with access and benefit-sharing under the Convention?

Benefit sharing does not exist in reality, in particular for the marine environments (e-g. fishing or mining in ABNJ).

And what are the implications for the post-2020 global biodiversity framework?

Need to review some points and adjust to make benefit sharing a reality beyond paper.

# Integrating diverse perspectives

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?

Very specific issue to be considered country by country.

How should gender issues be reflected in the scope and content of the post2020 global biodiversity framework?

By remarking in documents, the need of related experts and Bodies participation and consultation on issues with questions where gender is affected e.g. Women have key roles in certain areas such as coastal fisheries topics. There is a need to approach those concrete areas, having due regard of specificities within each country.

.

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?

Let the country solve this point, although providing guidelines and case studies.

How can the post2020 global biodiversity framework facilitate the involvement of civil society in the development and implementation of the framework?

Do advocacy and fluent top-bottom communication to reaching out civil society groups to allow them to timely transferring views to the Convention.

Strong development of sustainable production and consumption patterns should be mainstreamed into consumers.

Use national tools such as EIA and SEA processes.

Use international tools as the Aarhus Convention, still underused and undersigned or ratified.

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

Media campaign at the global, regional, National and local levels using both modern and classic fashion tools according to the countries (not all people are connected).

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?

A general need on the above is to further engage business, including small sized, on voluntary commitments, notably on sustainable production and consumption.

Weak point, except for some large business aimed to advertising their business.

Greenwashing to be considered as an issue to be precluded through preventive measures.

Foundations activities to be valorised and promoted.

How should the post-2020 global biodiversity framework reflect diverse and multiple perspectives?

Regional policies should be integrated in the framework for aiding to better reach targets.

While SCBD will organise a workshop on June 2019 to exchange on Post 2020 views with other MEAs, Regional Seas Conventions have not been considered as participants, though they could much contribute to the Marine global and regional dimensions of the biodiversity framework component, which embraces the biggest surface of the Planet. So, a specific gathering along 2019 for addressing ocean issues in the RS

framework should be of value to reflect diverse and multiple perspectives for the marine environment.

Different approaches for the global, regional, sub regional, national and local approaches are needed.

# Communication and outreach

How should the post-2020 global biodiversity framework address issues related to communication and awareness?

Use modern and traditional media channels, as connected messages are targeting maximum 50% of the people that are jumping from a topic to another. Local people have no time or funds for this approach.

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?

People see as important what they can relate to their lives. For example, pollinators depletion and plastic challenges give good message for awareness and get big social response. Need to further raise sensitizing on key pressures, like those coming from fisheries and agriculture, to better connect to society on ecosystems services.

Needs on sharp changes in economies for the sake of sustainability need to be transmitted together with sensitising on transitional steps need to address loss of income in sectors.

Examples of tough industrial reforms around the world for purely economic change of paradigma reasons exist. Now environmental ones should take the lead, so national communication strategies should be developed for each country and its diverse sectors being affected.

Best cases guides on successful and unsuccessful experience of countries on environmental communication need to be developed

Messages need to be done in coordinated way to public. Need more coordinated approach to avoid contradictions.