

## **Submission by the EU and its Member States to CBD Notification 2019-008: the Post-2020 global biodiversity framework**

### **Introduction**

The EU and its Member States welcome the consultation launched by the CBD (see Notification 2019-008). The present reply reflects discussions within our administrations and at national and regional level, including the regional consultation meeting for the Western Europe and Others Group and the EU Member States in Bonn, 19-21 March 2019.

This submission builds on the EU and its Member States contribution sent on 20 December 2019 (response to CBD Notification 2018-063).

We would like to highlight the relevance and timeliness of the Global Assessment adopted at the 7<sup>th</sup> IPBES Plenary (Paris, 29 April – 5 May), the State of the World's of Biodiversity for Food and Agriculture welcomed by FAO (CGRFA 17, Rome, Italy, 18-22 February 2019) as well as the Global Environment Outlook launched at UNEA4 (Nairobi, Kenya, 11-15 March 2019).

Without prejudice to our final position, we wish the options presented in this submission to be further explored in the context of the Open Ended Working Group.

**A. *Question (paragraph 11): 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?***

In order to contribute to the achievement of the 2050 Vision on living in harmony with nature, the following elements should be included in the post-2020 framework:

- A collective, inspirational, motivating and easy-to-communicate Mission, possibly including a measurable overarching objective if feasible, see reply to question D (paragraph 14);
- Specific, ambitious, realistic and, where possible measurable and time-bound objectives and targets, organised in a more logical structure and building on the current Aichi Biodiversity Targets, to help communication and implementation, see reply to question E (paragraph 15);
- Baseline, indicators and monitoring framework and, where possible, milestones, see the reply to question J;
- A monitoring and review process and a mechanism to step-up or redirect actions (if needed) in successive stages, see the reply to questions K and N;
- Strengthened existing and new instruments for effective implementation, including the National Biodiversity Strategies and Action Plans (NBSAPs) and potential CBD Work Programmes, as appropriate.

There should be clear and logical links between the 2050 Vision, the Mission and different groups of targets. There is a need to distinguish more clearly between the objectives/targets for the state of biodiversity, actions addressing the direct drivers and root causes of biodiversity loss and enabling conditions.

Clear linkages with the SDGs and other relevant international frameworks/organisation are needed and cross-cutting issues (gender, youth, IPLC, education, mainstreaming etc.) need to be addressed adequately.

**B. *Question (paragraph 12): In the context of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework, what would “ambitious” specifically mean?***

The post-2020 framework should provide an overarching biodiversity framework across the UN and for all stakeholders towards the 2050 Vision on biodiversity. The framework should strengthen the implementation of the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD) and its Protocols, as well as of the other Rio Conventions and the Paris Agreement and other biodiversity related multilateral environmental agreements (MEAs), and contribute to the relevant SDGs. The framework should place biodiversity and ecosystem services high on political agendas.

For the EU and its Member States, an "ambitious" framework means a framework that spurs the actions and transformational changes needed for reaching the 2050 Vision and achieving the objectives of the CBD. The framework should reflect the scale and urgency of the necessary actions and the resources required. This should be based on an in-depth analysis of what the 2050 Vision means, notably with possible metrics developed in the context of the mission and by combining this with scenario analysis. See replies for C and D.

Transformative changes are needed in our societies to benefit both biodiversity and people and to support long-term sustainable development. “Transformative change” can be defined as a fundamental, system-wide reorganization across technological, economic and social factors, including paradigms, goals and values (IPBES, 2019; IPCC, 2018<sup>1</sup>). Transformative change is meant to simultaneously and progressively address direct and indirect drivers. As concluded in the IPBES Biodiversity Assessments, this includes, among others, absolute decoupling of economic growth from resource use and negative environmental impact is required. The character and trajectories of this transformation will be different in different contexts, with challenges and needs differing across countries and regions.

The framework needs to be ambitious and inspiring, and at the same time realistic and achievable. Targets should be formulated in a way commensurate to the challenges and to spur ambitious commitments by Parties.

**C. *Question (Paragraph 13): 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?***

Living in harmony with nature entails that our economies and societies reflect biodiversity's intrinsic value as well as the value of nature and ecosystem services to all aspects of sustainable development and security. It means that biodiversity and healthy and well-managed ecosystems provide their services to people’s lives in a sustainable manner. Living in harmony implies that future generations can benefit from nature and ecosystem services at least as much as the current generation.

---

<sup>1</sup> IPCC special report on global warming of 1.5 degrees.

Living in harmony with nature requires tackling the causes of declining biodiversity, including overconsumption and unsustainable production as well as population dynamics and trends. As a key element of “living in harmony with nature”, full mainstreaming of biodiversity across all sectors and policies should be a reality by 2050.

In the light of the biodiversity crisis and the unprecedented extinction rate described in section C of the SPM of the IPBES Global Assessment, the planetary boundaries and the risks of collapse of ecosystems, actions to achieve ‘living in harmony with nature’ are more urgent than ever.

All elements of the 2050 Vision <sup>2</sup> are relevant for the post-2020 framework.

***D. Question (Paragraph 14): What would be the elements and contents of an actionable 2030 Mission statement for the post-2020 global biodiversity framework?***

The 2030 Mission should be precise, motivating, actionable, science-based and easy to communicate to the public, the private sector and other relevant stakeholders.

The Mission could include, if feasible an overarching objective, acting as a clear and measurable milestone on the path to the 2050 Vision. Parties could set corresponding headline objectives at national level, complemented with additional indicators adapted to the national context. Various options are under discussion in various fora and can be taken into account in the work of the Open Ended Working Group, when mature.

Scientists are working on options of an overarching objective to be monitored at global level on the basis of a few indicators, e.g. the red-list index, the living planet index and indicators for ecosystem condition or biodiversity intactness, and indicators on sustainably managed areas (which are under development).

Without prejudice to our final position, we wish the options to be explored in more depth.

***E. Questions (paragraph 15) on biodiversity targets:***

In the context of this question, we would like to refer to the discussions at the 26 February 2019 OECD workshop on “The post-2020 Biodiversity Framework: Targets, indicators and measurability implications at global and national level” on 26 February 2019 in Paris (<http://www.oecd.org/environment/resources/biodiversity/oecdinternationalworkshoponthe-post-2020biodiversityframeworktargetsindicatorsandmeasurabilityimplicationsatglobalandnationallevel.htm>).

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

The key practical implication of “SMART” targets is that they should be specific and measurable (but not necessarily ‘quantified’ in absolute terms), accompanied by clear indicator(s), timeline and a baseline to allow for effective review of progress and implementation. As far as possible, the targets should lend themselves to a regional and/or national disaggregation. SMART targets should also be ambitious and, at the same time, realistic and based on an assessment of the required actions and means of implementation, which should be part of the process of developing the post-2020 framework.

---

<sup>2</sup> “By 2050, biodiversity is valued, conserved, restored and wisely used, maintaining ecosystem services, sustaining a healthy planet and delivering benefits essential for all people.”

Unclear or ambiguous wording should be avoided as much as possible, such as "where appropriate" (Aichi Target 2), "where feasible" (Aichi Target 5), "substantially" (Target 20) and "minimised" (Target 10).

Connections and interactions between different targets should be clear, so as to identify the most effective actions and policy tools for achieving multiple goals simultaneously, including actions that benefit several ecosystems or ecosystem services at the same time.

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

Post-2020 targets should build on the current Aichi Targets, making them more specific, measurable and time bound where feasible and realistic. They should be easy to communicate. The presentation of the targets needs to be structured differently and, without over-complicating the framework, take into account the outcomes from the IPBES assessments, e.g. as regards the ranking of drivers.

Further consideration needs to be given to how some emerging issues and possible gaps, such as pollinators, health, biotechnologies, climate change, biodiversity in urban areas, and plastics, could be addressed.

***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 SDGs provide globally agreed targets for a range of activities until 2030, many of which cannot be achieved without healthy ecosystems. Targets set under the post-2020 biodiversity framework, while focused on reversing the trend and bending the curve of biodiversity loss, will be essential for delivering on these SDGs.

Coherence and close connection with the SDGs and other frameworks is very important, especially when addressing mainstreaming (across sectors and policies) and enabling conditions but this should not exclude adjustment of the formulation or level of ambition where needed. This needs to be assessed on a case-by-case basis. It is important to emphasise the benefits and contribution of the biodiversity targets to achieve the SDGs and the Paris Agreement and vice versa. A clear relationship is important to facilitate the understanding both by the wide public and by the policy makers.

Similar to the lead agency approach used for the SDGs, other MEAs and relevant sectoral organizations should be invited to contribute to the development of and in subsequent implementation of specific targets related to their respective policies so as to ensure coherence and synergies and to increase ownership and responsibility for their engagement.

Coherence will also require taking into account the post-2020 biodiversity framework when implementing the Agenda 2030, notably the biodiversity related SDGs based on the current biodiversity framework. The CBD Secretariat should pursue ways to do this in preparation for the UN Heads of State Summit or the UN Resolution for endorsement by the UN General Assembly is important also for integrating the post-2020 framework in national strategies and policies.

**F. Question (Paragraph 16): What form should voluntary commitments for biodiversity take and how should these relate to or be reflected in the post-2020 global biodiversity framework?**

The EU and its Member States welcome the Sharm El-Sheikh to Kunming Action Agenda and the call for commitments in COP Decision IV/xx.

The EU and its Member States consider it essential to include in the post-2020 framework a process to ensure timely implementation and to foster political and stakeholder engagement. For strengthening NBSAPs, this could include a process or mechanism for Parties for biodiversity commitments, individually or jointly. This process should also facilitate and encourage voluntary commitments by non-State actors.

As indicated in the EU and its Member States reply of 20 December 2018 to notification 2018-063 (p.4), the post-2020 framework should “*establish the modalities for ensuring a strong contribution from such commitments, including for review of implementation, assessment whether they allow achieving the global targets and ratcheting up if needed. This should be coherent with the monitoring and review mechanisms for overall implementation of the new framework as referred to above.*”

Commitments can take many forms, but modalities should address:

- the timing;
- information to be included in the description, including as regards their relation with the relevant targets, the envisaged means for implementation and the way in which they relate/complement/exceed the relevant NBSAP;
- reporting, review and potential ratcheting up, see the reply to question N below.

For effectiveness and efficiency, commitments should be encouraged in particular with respect to the main drivers of biodiversity loss and the effort should be commensurate to the relevant challenge/target.

Commitments should respect the principle of non-regression, taking into account the various dimensions of SMART formulation.

**G. Question (Paragraph 17): 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?**

Endorsement of the post-2020 framework as the biodiversity policy framework throughout the UN system would in itself foster coherence, integration and synergies. The Rio Conventions, FAO, UNEP, UN Forum on Forests and biodiversity-related multilateral environmental agreements should be closely involved in the preparation of the post-2020 framework and its subsequent implementation. Existing frameworks under other conventions/organisations should be used as much as possible, without prejudice to additional or more ambitious provisions where appropriate. The same applies to existing collaborative partnerships, such as for forests and soil.

Both MEAs as well as key UN organizations should be invited to contribute to the development and implementation of specific targets related to their respective policies so as to ensure coherence and synergies, and to increase ownership and responsibility for their engagement.

As regards coherence with the 2030 Agenda, see the reply under E above.

**H. *Question (Paragraph 18): How can the post-2020 global biodiversity framework incorporate or support the mainstreaming of biodiversity across society and economies at large?***

The EU and its Member States reiterate the importance of mainstreaming as underlined in, i.a. our reply of 20 December 2018 to Notification 2018-063 (notably p.3), as well as many elements in the replies to other questions in the present submission.

Mainstreaming of biodiversity should be included both as a transversal approach, as well as through possible specific and measurable targets for several key sectors and policies, including to address unsustainable consumption and production patterns. It should give greater opportunities for the private sector to play an active role.

The long term strategic approach for mainstreaming biodiversity should be a core element of the post-2020 framework, to ensure enabling actions and conditions with engagement of all relevant sectors including private sector, land owners and users.

The SDGs provide an enabling framework for mainstreaming.

**I. *Question (paragraph 19): 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?***

Key lessons learned include:

- the SMARTer targets are, the more they foster effective and efficient implementation;
- Regular monitoring and reporting can also foster implementation
- Progress can be improved by adequate tools and strengthened instruments to ensure their implementation;
- Political commitment, including at heads of State level and government, is needed;
- A sound scientific underpinning and knowledge base are of needed, as well as respecting the precautionary principle;
- A Party-driven process and non-state actors involvement are important for fostering ownership and implementation;
- Lack of coherence between the Strategic Plan and NBSAPs hampered review of implementation and assessment of progress towards the targets;
- Targets need to focus not only on the quantitative dimension, but also qualitative dimension, e.g. in the context of protected areas and OECMs;
- A better strategy of communication improves political and social engagement and helps the implementation of the targets;
- Ownership and responsibility of other MEAs and relevant UN organisations are needed for the aspects under their competence;
- Need for stronger national coordination processes whereby relevant stakeholders, experts, national focal points (e.g. from other MEAs and other relevant organisations) are involved and are included in the post-2020 process to enhance ownership and participation;
- Need for mainstreaming of biodiversity in all sectors of public and private governance which is essential for the success of implementation and which needs a stronger political will across all levels;

- Need to reflect at all levels the real cost of ecosystem degradation and the real added value of investments in nature. “Externalities” are very poorly reflected in current investments and general policies (lack of visibility), with a strong bias towards not paying the full cost of environmental damage and not fully benefiting from services provided to biodiversity and nature. These “externalities” relate to cross sector implications, impacts beyond borders or consequences on sustainability and natural capital in the long run;
- Need to enhance compliance of existing environmental laws, policies, licenses, permits etc. If all the existing environment management and protection rules were followed, biodiversity conservation would be vastly improved. 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.
- Adopt the indicator and monitoring framework (baseline, indicators) at the same time as the targets, building on existing indicators both within the biodiversity community and elsewhere e.g. the FAO indicators for sustainable agriculture in SDG context.

***J. Question (paragraph 20): 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?***

Identifying the requisite indicators should go hand in hand with the drafting of the targets. Various organisations (including science/academia) and stakeholders are working on this, such as IPBES and the OECD. The Biodiversity Indicators Partnership should have a strong role and Parties and other relevant stakeholders should be closely associated. Indicators adopted by Parties for SDGs should be examined by the BIP and by the lead agencies for those SDGs (e.g. SDG Target/indicators 2.4.1 on agriculture, (<http://www.fao.org/3/a-i6919e.pdf>), 6 on wetlands, 14 on marine biodiversity and 15.3 on land degradation and Global Core Set of Indicators for SDG 15.2 'progress towards sustainable forest management. Existing indicators, data collection, monitoring and reporting processes should be used where relevant, adjusted in appropriate ways if necessary (e.g., to relate more specifically to the adopted targets). The use of existing indicators as much as possible is crucial for avoiding undue administrative and financial burden, both for Parties as for the CBD Secretariat.

***K. Question (Paragraph 21): 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?***

In line with the replies above, the post-2020 framework can strengthen effectiveness and implementation of the NBSAPs by:

- Setting a communicable and actionable 2030 Mission, and if feasible an overarching objective as a milestone towards the 2050 Vision;
- Setting specific, ambitious, realistic, and where possible measurable and time-bound targets together with the requisite indicator and monitoring framework;
- Strengthening monitoring and review of the NBSAPs, the commitments and their implementation;
- make better use of existing guidance and instruments, and develop these further where needed, for better implementation;

- Ensure closer alignment between NBSAPs and the global framework in order to make them more comparable and to facilitate an assessment of collective actions taken (or foreseen to be taken) at regional or global level. This would allow timely assessment of whether or not we are globally on track to achieve the long term vision and mission. This could draw on experiences and lessons learned under other Conventions;
- Addressing issues relevant under multiple frameworks in a synergistic way;
- Ensuring that resource mobilisation, capacity building and mainstreaming are integral elements of the framework.;
- Fostering coherence and synergies among the Convention and its Protocols and with biodiversity related and other multilateral environmental agreements;
- Fostering synergies with actions to implement the Paris Agreement;
- Supporting resource mobilisation at all levels.

In addition:

- The Strategic Approach for Mainstreaming, the Long-Term Strategy for Capacity Building, the Communication, Education, Public Awareness Raising Programme (CEPA) should be as operational as possible;
- Partnerships with relevant stakeholders, e.g. from industry, science/academia, civil society, sub-national actors will remain essential;
- The post-2020 global biodiversity framework should help clarify the role of existing and possibly new work programmes, which should be updated accordingly;
- The Clearing House Mechanism (CHM)<sup>3</sup> should be further developed to follow up the implementation of the targets, the NBSAPs, national reports and more. Integration of the CHMs of the Protocol in the global CHM should be further enhanced. Knowledge management should be improved in order to learn from best practices and other lessons learned while implementing the Aichi targets and the NBSAPs. The Bioland tool for the National CHM should be further developed and include inter-operability with the global CHM, INFORMEA, GBIF, UNEP-WCMC and other information sources on biodiversity. The role of the Clearing House Mechanism should also be increased to support capacity building;
- Programmes/projects for capacity building for revising NBSAPs and related monitoring and reporting frameworks, and for putting in place the data collection and monitoring systems, should start to be developed ahead of COP 15, in view of launching such programmes/projects as soon as possible after the COP.

***L. Question (paragraph 22): 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?***

As foreseen in Decision XIV/22, resource mobilisation will be an integral part of the post-2020 framework. The mobilisation of resources from all sources needs to be increased and their allocation should be optimized in order to close the current and future gaps of biodiversity finance. Efficiency and cost-effectiveness is of utmost importance.

---

<sup>3</sup> The term 'clearing house mechanism' is difficult to communicate and a more meaningful term may be considered, e.g. biodiversity information system.

There is a need for coherently addressing financing/resource mobilisation, harmful subsidies, positive and negative incentives, innovative funding mechanisms and the balance between various targets, e.g. speeding up action to address the drivers of biodiversity loss would mitigate costs of restoration. It is crucial that policies and investment decisions better reflect the negative impacts (negative “externalities”) of ecosystem degradation and the co-benefits (positive externalities) of investments in nature/natural capital.

Resource mobilization has various elements, including: increasing efficiency of the available resources, reducing the need for resources and the generation of new resources from all sources. Resource mobilisation is very closely linked to the mainstreaming discussions. When biodiversity is better mainstreamed and if we go towards a more circular economy, resources and means of implementation will be used more efficiently. We reiterate that resource mobilisation encompasses financial, human and technical resources.

Enhancing cost-effectiveness and more effective uptake of available funds should receive specific attention, as well as integration of biodiversity related targets in financial programmes.

Domestic resource mobilization should be improved, including through adequate capacity building and awareness raising and the integration of resource mobilisation in the NBSAPs.

***M. Question (paragraph 23): 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?***

In accordance with Decision 14/23, paragraph 14, COP 15 will consider the funding needs assessment carried out by the GEF in view of the eight replenishment. This needs assessment should take account not only of the current NBSAPs, but also anticipate additions or changes resulting from the expected post-2020 global biodiversity framework.

The integrated approach towards biodiversity loss, land degradation and climate change should be a central theme throughout the post 2020 framework, including within the UN Decade on Ecosystem restoration and the Egyptian initiative on these issues. These are all three focal areas for the GEF. GEF supports an integrated approach between focal areas and within the integrated programs in GEF-7 that is expected to maximize synergies and progress in delivering better results to meet ambitious GEF-7 goals. The distribution of financing between the focal areas of the GEF is determined every four years in the replenishment of the funds resources. Replenishment negotiations for GEF 8 are foreseen to start in the second half of 2021.

***N. Question (paragraph 24): 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 EU and its Member States welcome and support Decision XIV/29 recognizing the voluntary peer review as one of the elements of the multidimensional review process under the Convention and launching a review based on voluntary reports for SBI 3. National reports pursuant to Article 26 of the Convention should remain a cornerstone for review. However, a stronger review process is needed and this would be facilitated by more specific, measurable and time-bound targets, and closer alignment between NBSAPs and the post-2020 framework. The EU and its Member States would welcome to discuss a possible mechanism for ratcheting up implementation, NBSAPs and commitments.

We request the co-chairs of the OEWG and the CBD Secretariat to clarify potential implications and options for aligning national reporting under the Convention and its Protocols.

***O. Question (paragraph 25): What are the issues associated with biosafety under the Convention and what are the implications for the post-2020 global biodiversity framework?***

The biosafety provisions of the Convention are only partially covered by the Cartagena Protocol and are outlined in particular in Article 8 of the Convention: “Each Contracting Party shall, as far as possible and as appropriate [...] (g) Establish or maintain means to regulate, manage or control the risks associated with the use and release of living modified organisms resulting from biotechnology which are likely to have adverse environmental impacts that could affect the conservation and sustainable use of biological diversity, taking also into account the risks to human health”. A possible target of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework in the area of biosafety could therefore be that all Parties possess and maintain the regulatory framework and the capacity to regulate, manage or control the risks associated with the use and release of living modified organisms which are likely to have adverse environmental impacts that could affect the conservation and sustainable use of biological diversity, taking also into account the risks to human health. The discussion should also take into account the input from the Parties to the Cartagena Protocol.

***P. Question (paragraph 26): 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?***

The ABS provisions of the Convention are only partially covered by the Nagoya Protocol and, in line with COP decision 14/31, further integration of ABS into all relevant areas of work of the Convention is needed. Better integration of ABS issues into the implementation of the Convention is important and should be understood as acknowledging the need to better implement the third objective of the Convention. At the same time, integration of ABS into other areas of work of the Convention and the post-2020 should also be carried out in a comprehensive way, and in particular by understanding better the relationship between the ABS provisions in the Convention with its 2 other objectives, namely the conservation of biodiversity and sustainable use of its components.

Some areas of work to consider further integration of ABS into the implementation of the Convention are also related to cross-cutting issues of relevance to the Convention and the Nagoya Protocol, such as capacity building, clearing house mechanisms, resource mobilization, and national reporting.

***Q.:***

- a. Question: 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?***
- b. Question: How should gender issues be reflected in the scope and content of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework?***
- c. 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?***

- d. ***Question: How can the post-2020 global biodiversity framework facilitate the involvement of civil society in the development and implementation of the framework?***
- e. ***Question: How can the post-2020 global biodiversity framework facilitate the involvement of youth in the development and implementation of the framework?***
- f. ***Question: 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?***

All groups mentioned above are to be involved actively in the preparatory process and are invited to share their perspectives and contribute to developing the global framework.

The EU and its Member States stress the important role that indigenous peoples and local communities (IPLC) have for the work of the CBD. As regards the involvement of IPLC in the post-2020 global biodiversity framework, the EU and its Member States consider full and effective participation of IPLC in the work of the CBD to be an important base for its success. For further details, including on the programme of work on Article 8(j) and related provisions, see EU+MS reply of 22 March 2019 to CBD Notification 2019-004. Traditional knowledge and customary sustainable use, offer a good and complementary knowledge base in the implementation of the CBD in the future. The voluntary Glossary annexed to CBD decision 14/13 defines traditional knowledge as “the knowledge, innovations and practices of indigenous and local communities embodying traditional lifestyles relevant for the conservation and sustainable use of biological diversity.” While integrating traditional knowledge as a cross-cutting element in the post-2020 global biodiversity framework, it is important to focus not only on the backward-looking aspects, but also on the innovations and other forward-looking elements of this knowledge system.

The post-2020 framework should underline the importance of taking into account gender and refer to the relevant SDGs. In 2008, Parties to the CBD adopted the Gender Plan of Action, making it the first Multilateral Environmental Agreement (MEA) to do so. This Plan was updated for the period 2015-2020. CBD has integrated actions to enhance the monitoring framework and indicator system for gender mainstreaming within programmes and at national level. Parties often still under-report on gender specific information or have not included it in their NBSAPs. The SDG framework provides the methodology for indicators with the potential to measure the gender-environment nexus. Existing gender inequalities can be further amplified by the impacts of biodiversity loss and climate change, thus intensifying the constraints felt by different gender groups who rely on agriculture, fisheries, energy and natural resources for their livelihoods and negatively impacting environmental sustainability and poverty reduction.

There is a need to fully analyse these gender-differentiated roles of natural resource management and ensure that women’s and men’s specific knowledge in these areas are being equally integrated into programs and policies. Furthermore, we must actively work to promote women’s equal access to rights and engagement in decision-making processes on resource management. Care should be taken to avoid implicit or explicit use of stereotypes as regards roles and expectations.

Thus five objectives are proposed: develop, enrich and share a gender-sensitive culture of nature, make gender a positive issue for decision-makers concerned by biodiversity, include the gender factor and encourage to produce gender desegregated data in the preservation and restoration of ecosystems and their functioning, Include gender sensitivity in economic decision-making related to biodiversity, develop innovations for and by women in biodiversity.

We note the outcome of the workshop in New York<sup>4</sup>, which concluded that "the implementation of a post-2020 framework as well as the CBD gender action plan should, by 2030, ensure that women and girls are taking on effective stewardship and are equally benefiting from biodiversity and ecosystem services."

As the youth and the generations to come will suffer the most from the loss of biodiversity and degrading ecosystems that result from our actions today, we urgently need to integrate their perspectives to ensure a sustainable future. The youth plays an important role as inspirational agents and active managers of change and by developing innovative solutions. At global level, the Global Youth and Biodiversity Network should be closely involved in the development and implementation of the post-2020 framework. Furthermore, at national level, coordination mechanisms should include youth representatives when discussing and implementing the framework.

Parties and stakeholders could be invited to strengthen the teaching of natural sciences and knowledge related to biodiversity. UNESCO and UNICEF could be invited to strengthen the integration of biodiversity in their respective frameworks.

The engagement of the private sector is important to contribute to an effective mainstreaming of biodiversity within the post-2020 framework and carrier of transformational changes, i.e. by creating new partnerships with businesses and enterprises. Also, regarding biodiversity financing, the private sector plays a significant role.

The Action Agenda and the process for biodiversity commitments made on a voluntary basis are key tools for encouraging the involvement of subnational governments, cities and other local authorities, civil society, the private sector and other relevant stakeholders.

***R. Question: How should the post-2020 global biodiversity framework reflect diverse and multiple perspectives?***

The Action Agenda and the process for voluntary commitments are key tools for involving diverse and multiple perspectives from the onset.

***S. 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?***

Communication would be significantly facilitated if the structure of the framework is logical, clear and simple.

---

<sup>4</sup> Expert workshop to develop recommendations for possible gender elements in the post 2020 global biodiversity framework, New York, 11-12 April 2019.

Communication is a key priority, see our previous submissions with respect to the post-2020 global biodiversity framework, which include references to the existing communication framework and the communication aspects addressed in the COP14 Decision on the preparatory process for the post-2020 framework. In addition/more specifically:

- strong communication campaigns should be launched to increase the visibility of the biodiversity crisis, highlight the urgency of stepping up actions necessary to achieve the objectives, and foster cooperation,
- communication toward Stakeholders should promote the "Sharm-el-Sheikh to Kunming Action Agenda for Nature and People",
- involving/engaging ambassadors/champions, VIPs or celebrities is urgent by now;
- raising awareness of the risks and costs associated to biodiversity loss on growth, security and any long-term environmental and socio-economic sustainability;
- work with the private sector in particular to reward best-practices, to highlight economic benefits and value of biodiversity, and reveal the real costs of negative impacts on the environment.

Keeping in mind that nature and biodiversity are two different concepts but acknowledging that the term biodiversity is difficult to communicate, in various situations the use of alternatives to the term biodiversity should be considered. In the communication of the post-2020 framework, such alternatives could be "Nature" or "Life".

---