16 April 2019

**NZ SUBMISSION ON POST-2020 BIODIVERSITY FRAMEWORK**

With reference to Notification 2019-008 of 30 January 2019, please find following New Zealand’s further views on the post-2020 biodiversity framework. This submission should be read in conjunction with our earlier submission of views on 17 December 2018.

* There is an urgent need for the new post-2020 framework to inspire more **ambition** at the national level, if we are to create a framework that supports the actions of all actors to stem the loss of biodiversity.
* On the **structure of the framework**, New Zealand believes that an apex target or limited number of “core biodiversity” targets (no more than five), with a larger number of more specific, supporting sub-targets and enablers underneath, could be a useful structure, particularly in terms of communications and generating political and public buy-in (i.e. having something simple and easy to explain to non-experts).
* The drawback of just one apex target is that it may be difficult to make it ‘SMART’. A single, high-level global political aspiration or commitment could, however, be expressed through an **updated mission statement**. Ideally this statement would be more concise and more focused than the mission statement of the Strategic Plan, which is long and unwieldly.
* There may be a role for a statement of **overarching principles**, for cross-cutting issues that are considered in a different category to enablers.
* **Sub-targets**, i.e. stepping stones to larger, more important targets, and potentially targeted to address specific responses or pressures, could be included under each target they are required for. Each sub-target should be SMART and accompanied by quantifiable and measurable indicators, where possible.
* Ensuring that the new targets are **evidence-based** and, wherever possible and appropriate, **quantifiable** will help to also ensure that they are specific, measurable, achievable, relevant, and time-bound. Some of the previous “targets” were arguably more enablers than actual targets, which meant that they have been harder to measure. Adjusting the structure as suggested above would help overcome this problem.
* States should be encouraged to identify actions and targets where they can achieve the most meaningful gains for biodiversity. As was the case for the Aichi Targets, Parties should focus on targets that are highly relevant to the achievement of significant biodiversity outcomes in their territories and regions, or globally. States, non-parties, and other actors should have flexibility in the pursuit of the targets and objectives, with the aim of ensuring that significant biodiversity gains can be made. This does not, however, mean that states and other actors should be able to not take action on targets that are relevant to them.
* We agree that, in some cases, the milestones on the way to the 2050 vision could involve time periods that are either shorter or longer than ten years. Periodically reviewing the amount of progress made and the direction and ambition required to reach the 2050 vision is essential. At the same time, this process can be resource intensive. **A time period of ten years** appears to be a good compromise between these two drivers. A round number would also, assumedly, help with communication efforts. This would not prevent NBSAPs or other tools dealing in shorter or longer time frames.
* A system of **review** that facilitates enhanced implementation efforts by Parties will be an important part of the post-2020 framework. New Zealand supports the approach outlined in Decision 14/29.
* **Enablers** (i.e. the things that make a target or achievement of a milestone possible, but are not an ends in and of themselves) could be included under targets and/or sub-targets as appropriate. Enablers should not be considered goals or targets.
* **Communication and awareness raising** will be an important enabler of the post-2020 biodiversity framework, and it will be important that the new framework/goals can be easily communicated to policy makers, the private sector, civil society, indigenous peoples, and the wider public who are not as familiar with biodiversity issues. It is important that this communication material is not weighed down with highly technical, legal, policy or management language.
* **Mainstreaming** the work of the CBD, and biodiversity as a global issue, into the consciousness of society, will be a key enabler for the post-2020 framework. Many past failings stemmed from an inability to engage actors outside of the CBD community on biodiversity issues, including society as a whole. It is particularly vital to address the drivers of biodiversity loss that stem from economic activity. Individual biodiversity issues garner significant attention worldwide, but the connection between these issues and the work of the CBD as the relevant global body is weak, for your average world citizen. Societal awareness drives private sector action and political prioritisation.
* The challenge of addressing biodiversity loss cannot be met by states alone. There is a role for states, international organisations, civil society, indigenous peoples and local communities, academia, the private sector, youth etc. **Active participation and support of all actors** will be an important enabler of the post-2020 framework.