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1. **ISSUES AND QUESTIONS FOR DISCUSSION**
2. Based on previous decision and submissions from Parties and observers, a number of issue areas are identified below. Some questions to stimulate further discussion are also provided.

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

1. Many submissions suggested that a structure or approach is needed to link the different elements of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework and to highlight the linkages between its different elements. In the submissions, several different possible models or approaches were proposed. Some of the suggested approaches have been a pyramid or tiered structure while othershave suggested structures similar to the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development and the current Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020. **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?**
* Link to SDGs structure.
* Parts that are specific for the issues regarding: Marine biodiversity, micro-organisms, livestock, plant biodiversity, wild species.

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

1. A general view is that the post-2020 global biodiversity framework should be ambitious and support the transformational changes needed to realize the 2050 Vision for Biodiversity. The post-2020 global biodiversity framework should serve as a universal framework for action on biodiversity and foster strong ownership and support for its implementation. **Question: In the context of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework, what would “ambitious” specifically mean?**
* “Ambitious” means to plan effective measures and to have real commitments from Contracting Parties in collaboration with civil society organizations and small scale agroecological producers.
* More specific and sectoral targets: address the specific targets to specific sector (plant, animal, marine, forests or micro-organisms). The percentage of reduction of the deforestation could be a specific target.
* Coherence with the FAO strategy on biodiversity.
* The protection of farmers’ rights in reproduce the biodiversity could also be considered “ambitious” for the post 2020 global framework for biodiversity.
* Coherence with the debate within the CFS.

**C. 2050 Vision for Biodiversity**

1. Decision 14/2, sets out that the 2050 Vision “Living in harmony with nature” remains relevant and should be considered in the post-2020 global biodiversity framework. Further many submissions also indicated that the rationale for the 2050 Vision should be further developed and that a common and clear understanding of what reaching the 2050 Vision for Biodiversity entails in concrete terms needs to be developed.  **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?**
* Major focus on agricultural biodiversity
* Inclusion of peasants, those who improve biodiversity in a sustainable way.
* Promote sustainable productions
* Fundamentally, living in harmony with nature means to recognise and respect the interdependence of humans and ecological systems. What this means in real terms can only be elaborated in specific, situated contexts, by and with those who live with and have tacit knowledge of ecological systems.
* All decisions regarding how we live well together should consider the impacts of our choices on future generations.
* Two pitfalls to avoid: man against nature (city + industrial agriculture) versus nature without man ("wild" nature parks isolated from ecological continents)

**D. Mission**

1. Decision 14/34 specifies that the post-2020 framework should be accompanied by an inspirational and motivating 2030 mission as a stepping stone towards the 2050 Vision “Living in harmony with nature”, and that it should be supported by a coherent, comprehensive and innovative communication strategy. The need for a clear definition of what the mission statement means in practice was noted in many submissions and different suggestions for its formulation have been submitted. **Question**: **What would be the elements and content of an actionable 2030 mission statement for the post-2020 global biodiversity framework?**
* Prohibition of any exclusive appropriation of elements of biodiversity (such as patents) and any action likely to irreversibly disrupt ecosystem balances (such as: terminator genes, gene drive, synthetic biology, massive destocking of carbon, and massive destruction of biomass)
* Protected access to global genetic resources and their information, to be developed with Indigenous Peoples and Local Communities.
* An effective Free Prior and Informed Consent mechanism, to be developed with Indigenous Peoples and Local Communities .
* Fair and sustainable food production, supporting small-scale agroecological farmers and those who improve biodiversity.

**E. Biodiversity Targets**

1. There is wide support for the post-2020 global biodiversity framework having a set of science- and knowledge-based “SMART” (specific, measurable, ambitious, realistic and time-bound) biodiversity targets for the period from 2021 to 2030. Several submissions noted that the Aichi Biodiversity Targets should be used as the basis for developing any new targets and that changes to these should be kept to a minimum. Alternatively, it was suggested that some “modernization” of the Aichi Targets might be required. Further, many submissions suggested possible new targets.  **Questions:**
	1. **What does “SMART” targets mean in practical terms?**
* Specific and sectoral targets/objectives developed by the Contracting Parties, in partnership with Civil Society, Indigenous Peoples and Local Communities.
* Involve CSOs in ongoing participatory monitoring and evaluation exercises, including reports on progress made towards the targets every 2 years.
	1. **How should the set of targets in the post-2020 global biodiversity framework relate to existing Aichi Biodiversity Targets?**
* The post 2020 targets should have the same framework as the Aichi Biodiversity targets. However, they should be more specific and include sub-groups specific to marine, forest, plant, animal genetic resources and micro-organisms, including mushrooms. Each specific target should have qualitative and quantitative indicators to support monitoring and evaluation exercises.
	1. **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 in line with the FAO Strategy on Biodiversity and with the Plan for Biodiversity of the CGRFA of the FAO. The post 2020 targets should also respect the articles of the ITPGRFA, including 5, 6 and 9.

**F. Voluntary commitments and contributions**

1. Decision 14/34 invites Parties and other Governments to consider developing biodiversity commitments which contribute to an effective post-2020 global biodiversity framework and encourages indigenous peoples and local communities and all relevant organizations and stakeholders, including the private sector, to contribute to the Sharm El-Sheikh to Beijing Action Agenda for Nature and People. Several submissions also commented on the desirability of voluntary commitments. However, others felt that voluntary commitments, while providing useful impetus, may not directly lead the global community to scientifically supported goals and outcomes. **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?**
* Voluntary Guidelines for specific targets: 5 different voluntary guidelines for: marine, forest, plant, animal genetic resources and micro-organisms. Governments will have to report the implementation on the guidelines during each COP of the CBD.

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

1. Many submissions note that the post-2020 global biodiversity framework should be consistent with the commitments, frameworks, processes and plans established by the biodiversity related conventions and other multilateral environmental agreements. Similarly, the need for the post-2020 global biodiversity framework to be coherent with and supportive of the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development, the Paris Agreement, the other two Rio conventions, the other biodiversity-related conventions, and FAO processes among other were frequently noted. A general view expressed in several submissions is that the post-2020 global biodiversity framework should be used to reinforce synergies within the United Nations System.  **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?**
* The post 2020 targets should first consider and do consultations with:
	+ ITPGRFA
	+ CGRFA
	+ FAO Biodiversity Mainstreaming Platform
	+ Declaration of Peasants Rights
* Post 2020 Targets should also consider the positions of small-scale agroecological producers in order to have coherent biodiversity targets with the sustainability of food production and the environment.

**H. Mainstreaming**

1. Decision 14/3 recognized that mainstreaming is critical for achieving the objectives of the Convention, the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020, its Aichi Biodiversity Targets and the 2050 Vision for Biodiversity and should be one of the key elements of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework in order to achieve the transformational change required throughout society and economies, including changes in behaviour and decision-making at all levels. Further, in decisions 14/3 and XIII/3, several specific sectors were highlighted owing to their dependencies and impacts on biodiversity and areas for development of a long-term strategic approach to biodiversity mainstreaming were identified. Several submissions pointed to the need for the post-2020 global biodiversity framework to offer greater opportunities for the mainstreaming of biodiversity across society and to develop synergies with other processes. The need to have a post-2020 global biodiversity framework which generates buy-in from sectors that are reliant on, and have significant impact on, biodiversity was also noted in many submissions. **Question: How can the post-2020 global biodiversity framework incorporate or support the mainstreaming of biodiversity across society and economies at large?**
* Promote:
	+ The multiplication and diversity of economic actors, the relocation of production as close as possible to where it is consumed;
	+ Food sovereignty to protect local economies and fight against monopolies
* Governments should mainstream the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity post 2020 in all decisions (policy, legislative, trade, etc) related to food, agriculture, and the environment.
* The UN System should also mainstream the new Strategic Plan for Biodiversity post 2020 throughout all of its relevant activities.
* CBD should facilitate and promote autonomous regional consultations with civil society and other stakeholders to build awareness and capacity on the ground in communities.

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

1. Many submissions note that the post-2020 global biodiversity framework should build from the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020. **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?**
* Lessons learned:
	+ Specific objectives, measurable targets, and strong commitments are essential to the success of the Plan.
	+ Implementation, monitoring, and evaluation exercises should be participatory, Governments should encourage and facilitate the meaningful involvement of civil society in these processes.
	+ Food producers were completely absent in the Aichi Targets: small-scale food producers are those primarily affected by the loss of biodiversity (and the associated traditional knowledge), and should be put front and centre.
* Delays in implementation could be avoided with regional evaluations on the status of the implementation of the Plan in the intersessional period of the COPs of the CBD. The CBD should facilitate the participation of small-scale agroecological food producers, Indigenous Peoples and Local Communities in regional evaluations.
* More attention should be focused on indicators and evaluations of implementation.

**J. Indicators**

1. The importance of identifying indicators for the different elements of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework was noted in many submissions. Most suggested that the starting point for indicators should be the indicators developed for the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020 noted in decision XIII/28. The indicators used in the IPBES global assessment were also suggested. The need for indicators which could be used at the global and regional level was also noted. **Question: 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?**
* National level
	+ Diversity of food available (perceptions of food producers/consumers)
	+ Implementation of specific targets through policies
	+ Dissemination of the post 2020 Strategic Plan for Biodiversity
	+ More direct association of the national plan with the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity post 2020
* Regional level
	+ Implementation of specific targets through regional policies
	+ Dissemination of the post 2020 Strategic Plan for Biodiversity
	+ Regional report on states of biodiversity.
	+ Number of regional consultations on the implementation of the post 2020 Strategic Plan for Biodiversity
* Global scale
	+ Number of global consultations on the implementation of the post 2020 Strategic Plan for Biodiversity
	+ FAO State on World Biodiversity
	+ Worldwide malnutrition level.

**K. Implementation and NBSAPs**

1. Many submissions noted the need to emphasize implementation in the post-2020 global biodiversity framework. The continued relevance of the NBSAPs for implementing the Convention was emphasized; however, many submissions also noted that the NBSAP process needs to be strengthened and accountability enhanced. Further many submissions noted the need for additional mechanisms to support implementation. **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?**
* There should be a mechanism that enables the participation of small-scale agroecological food producers, Indigenous Peoples and Local Communities in the construction of the National Biodiversity Strategies and Action Plans (NBSAPs).
* The framework should also provide the timing of the meetings to verify the implementation of the NBSAPs. Also online consultations to respond to the NBSAPs, could improve the efforts at national level.

**L. Resource mobilization**

1. Decision 14/22 affirms that resource mobilization will be an integral part of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework and decided to initiate preparations on this component at an early stage in the process of developing the framework, in full coherence and coordination with the overall process for the post-2020 framework. Further the decision also tasked an expert panel to undertake a number of activities, and to prepare reports, to contribute to the overall process for the post-2020 framework. The importance of resource mobilization, has also been underlined in many of the submissions. **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?**
* The post-2020 global biodiversity framework must be based on a resource mobilization strategy that includes the following aspects:
	+ The creation of a benefit-sharing fund, with contributions made by industries/research institutes/public institutions will fund on the basis of the benefits derived by the use of genetic resources.
	+ A mechanism to facilitate civil society and Indigenous Peoples and Local Communities’ participation in the decisions to use financial resources to implement the post-2020 global biodiversity framework.
	+ To collaboratively develop mechanisms with civil society for the implementation, monitoring, and evaluation of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework, including the provision of financial, technical, and other support to facilitate these activities.
* The scope of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework should include the commitment of governments and the active role of civil society, Indigenous Peoples and Local Communities and food producers’ organizations.

**M. Financial mechanisms**

1. Decision 14/23 welcomesthe successful conclusion of the seventh replenishment of the Global Environment Facility Trust Fund and expresses appreciation for the continuing financial support from Parties and Governments for carrying out the tasks under the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020 in its remaining years, and for supporting the implementation of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework in its first two years. **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?**
* The GEF should be supplemented by a compulsory levy on sales by large operators of tangible or intangible products (information, licences, etc.) resulting from the use of genetic resources
* The GEF should not only finance the activities of Contracting Parties, but also directly provide financial resources to farmers' organizations, local communities, indigenous peoples and Civil Society to improve more effectiveness and legitimacy of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework.
	+ It should be more inclusive and open calls to finance the activities/consultations of civil society organizations, Indigenous Peoples and Local Communities and food producers’ organizations.
	+ It should also provide a budget for specific activities of food producers’ organizations to support sustainable production that respect and improve biodiversity.

**N. Review process**

1. The need for an effective and timely review process for the post-2020 global biodiversity framework was noted in many submissions. In this respect, the continued importance of the national reports and the clearing-house mechanism of the Convention were highlighted. However, the need for more effective, robust and accountable national reporting was also highlighted. In addition, many submissions suggested additional mechanisms for reviewing progress in implementation and for building accountability and transparency. **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 review of the implementation of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework should also provide a mechanism for the evaluation by other UN Regional Agencies such as the FAO regional offices. It will give more coherence and effectiveness to the national reviews.

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

1. Decision CP-9/7 provides that biosafety should be reflected in the post-2020 global biodiversity framework and sets out steps towards the preparation of the biosafety component of the post-2020 framework. The decision also sets out a process for developing a specific Implementation Plan for the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety as a follow-up to the Strategic Plan for the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety for the period 2011-2020. **Question: What are the issues associated with biosafety under the Convention and what are the implications for the post-2020 global biodiversity framework?**
* The post-2020 global biodiversity framework should also take in consideration the innovations that are going against the implementation of the post 2020 targets. This means that the Protocol of Cartagena must follow the objectives and scope of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework.
* New biotechnologies, such as synthetic biology and gene editing have to be considered as part of the regulation process of the Cartagena Protocol.
* Moratorium on any use of the gene drive in an open environment.
1. Access and benefit-sharing is one of the three objectives of the Convention. Decision 14/31 and decision NP-3/15 specify that issues related to access and benefit sharing and the Nagoya Protocol should be considered in the development of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework. **Question: What are the issues associated with access and benefit-sharing under the Convention and what are the implications for the post-2020 global biodiversity framework?**
* The issues associated with access and benefit-sharing under the Convention should include:
	+ New technologies for sequencing the genome;
	+ Digital Sequence Information need to be addressed in regulations in order to protect public access to genetic resources, the common heritage of humankind
	+ An effective Free, Prior and Informed Consent.
	+ Farmers are the original plant breeders and have the primary responsibility for innovation and production of PGRFA but tend to be disconnected from plant breeders and national and international gene banks. However, most funded research is conducted *ex situ* by public and private sector researchers and plant breeders, whose activities are increasingly influenced by market demand for particular crops, and national and international gene banks, whose function is primarily conservation. Farmers’ contributions to crop diversity over several millennia have been made without established systems of recognition and reward. *In situ* conservation and breeding efforts by and for peasants should be prioritised.
	+ Biodiversity of extra-territorial marine areas.
* The post-2020 global biodiversity framework should then guarantee the principles of access and benefit sharing of the Nagoya Protocol and should also have the objective to ensure the rights of Indigenous Peoples and Local Communities to have a real Free, Prior and Informed Consent.

**P. Integrating diverse perspectives**

1. Many submissions noted that the development and implementation of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework will require a “whole of society approach”. The need to have greater involvement of some specific groups was repeatedly emphasized in the submissions, including:
	1. *Indigenous peoples and local communities*: the Conference of the Parties to the Convention on Biological Diversity, in decision 14/34, requested the Ad Hoc Open-ended Working Group on Article 8(j) and Related Provisions to provide recommendations concerning the potential role of traditional knowledge, customary sustainable use and the contribution of the collective actions of indigenous peoples and local communities to the post-2020 global biodiversity framework, in support of the work of the open-ended intersessional working group. The continued role of indigenous peoples and local communities and the importance of traditional and local knowledge in the post-2020 global biodiversity framework was also noted in several submissions. **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?**
* The post-2020 global biodiversity framework could integrate the small-scale agroecological food producers organizations to widen the issues related to biodiversity.
* The post-2020 global biodiversity framework should also provide a moment just for Indigenous peoples and local communities to evaluate the implementation of the framework and to really value their position, guaranteeing their autonomy.
* A true *dialógo de saberes –* that is, a dialogue of knowledges – should be fostered between those who live closely with ecological systems and those with other kinds of knowledge: policy, technical, scientific expertise. Indigenous and peasant peoples’ knowledge of how to live in harmony with nature – the 2050 vision - should be foregrounded and lead policy and research agendas.
	1. *Women and gender*: decision 14/34 specifies that the process for developing the post-2020 global biodiversity framework will be gender-responsive by systematically integrating a gender perspective. **Question: How should gender issues be reflected in the scope and content of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework?**
* Gender issues should be mainstreamed in each target of the post-2020 global framework. A particular section of each target should aim for the participation, protection and support of women.
	1. *Subnational governments, cities and other local authorities*: it was observed that subnational governments, cities and other local authorities have an important role to play in on-the-ground implementation of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework and that this needs to be recognized. **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?**
* Subnational governments, cities and other local authorities could play a key role in the mainstreaming of the post-2020 global framework.
* Subnational governments, cities and other local authorities should be enabled to propose activities to implement the post-2020 global framework and the Governments should support them.
	1. *Civil society*: the need to enhance the participation, at the national, regional and international levels, of civil society in the post-2020 process was noted. **Question: How can the post-2020 global biodiversity framework facilitate the involvement of civil society in the development and implementation of the framework?**
* Civil Society should have the opportunity to propose modifications of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework prior to the next COP of the CBD.
* Governments should finance autonomous consultations of civil society (including also food producers’ organizations, Indigenous Peoples and Local Communities).
	1. *Youth*: the need to promote youth participation in the development and implementation of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework was noted. **Question: How can the post-2020 global biodiversity framework facilitate the involvement of youth in the development and implementation of the framework?**
* Enable young people to debate from the place where they live and consider their specificities (Indigenous Peoples and Local Communities, small-scale agroecological farmers).
	1. *Private sector*: it was suggested in several submissions that there is a need for greater involvement of the private sector in biodiversity issues. **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?**
* Private sector should be transparent in their activities, accountable to publics and should respect and facilitate the scope and objectives of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework.
* The private sector can only act under the mediation of nation states (it cannot replace them)
1. As noted above, many of the submissions have expressed a desire to integrate multiple and diverse perspectives in the post-2020 global biodiversity framework. As also noted above, some of the submissions have given particular attention to specific groups which should be involved and reflected in the post-2020 global biodiversity framework. **Question: How should the post-2020 global biodiversity framework reflect diverse and multiple perspectives?**
* On line consultations in local languages;
* Regional consultations with civil society in local languages;
* Periodical evaluations.
* Important to note that while multiple and diverse perspectives are important, ultimately it is the rights-holders, those most affected by biodiversity loss, and those who are involved in protecting and enhancing biodiversity whose perspectives should be foregrounded. Governments, as duty bearers, have obligations to protect public goods for their citizens. Private sector interests, although they may have diverse perspectives, should ensure their activities are in service of protecting and enhancing biodiversity for publics now and in the future. This should be judged by publics themselves. Private sector perspectives based on their internally funded research should be considered carefully in relation to this important distinction.

**Q. Communication and outreach**

1. Decision 14/34 specifies that the post-2020 framework should be supported by a coherent, comprehensive and innovative communication strategy. In addition, the need for effective, coherent, comprehensive and targeted communication, both during the development of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework and after its adoption, as well as the importance of ensuring that the framework can be easily communicated, were noted in many submissions. **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?**
* Short-term radio programmes on the post-2020 global biodiversity framework can be developed for local community radio stations. In many places, it is the only information access tool for the population, but it must be in the local language.
* Communication using and respecting the diversity of local languages and local information vectors, which are not all dematerialized
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