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**Introduction**

This submission is in response to the call by the Convention on BioDiversity (CBD) (deadline 15 April 2019) on the Strategy and Targets for the Global BioDiversity Targets for 2020 -2050. We are glad of this opportunity to submit but we do recognise that we have not yet fully caught up with the discussions and progress so far.

In this submission, we introduce ECO and our interest in the issues.

We then cover the urgency of the task, some of the changes in conceptions attitudes and behaviour that will need to underpin the changes needed and the transitions paths, particularly in the light of the irreversibility and non-substitutablity of biodiversity, the need for transitions in the way and the what that we produce and consume, and the reconceptualising public policy frameworks and personal attitudes and behaviours that are necessary to keep humanity in harmony with nature and with social justice.

We identify some areas we consider to be gaps or not well provided for . We suggest some approaches to those topics and also endorse IUCN’s suggestions for adding some targets for specific places or ecotypes and sectors.

For the sake of easy reference, we also reproduce the Aichi Targets and have made suggested amendments (in underline) and strikeouts. We give commentary from ECO in blue for each target for ease of navigation. We hope these are helpful.

We have also appended the text of the CBD’s discussion paper as Appendix 1, and the existing unmodified Aichi targets to this submission as Appendix 2.

There is a partial bibliography provided before the appendices.

We have written this submission in some haste, given that we missed noting the deadline, so had only a short time to prepare it. As is well known, there is an enormous literature on the problems and losses of biodiversity, on the actions taken and needed and the principles behind these, and on the shortfalls of action.

We have rather struggled to catch up with the thinking and papers and reports associated with this process since we are a national organization of organisations with a concern for the environment, with few resources but for skilled volunteers and board members, all done on a voluntary basis. We have no paid policy staff and are also dealing with a large number of domestic environmental and sustainability issues and law changes as our government elected in the last quarter of 2017 begins to convert its ideas into policy and law.

We make some suggestions in relation to your discussion paper and some in relation to questions put to us by the New Zealand Ministry of Foreign Affairs (MFAT), though did not have time to address all of these We apologise for the at times somewhat strange formatting in the submission, and any typos and other production errors.

Should you wish to contact us, please email [eco@eco.org.nz](mailto:eco@eco.org.nz) and [Cath.Wallace10@gmail.com](mailto:Cath.Wallace10@gmail.com)

**Introduction to ECO and its interest in this matter**

The Environment and Conservation Organisations of NZ (ECO) is the national alliance of 49 groups with a concern for the environment and conservation. We were established in 1971-72. Some of our member bodies are themselves federations or multiple groups. Many are area-based, some are focused on specific species or activities or impacts, some are not actually environmental groups but share our concerns.

ECO has followed issues of conservation and environmental management and practice, law and policy since its formation in 1971-2. We have member groups from all around New Zealand. We take an interest in both national and global matters and of course many local issues.

We support Te Tiriti o Waitangi (The Treaty of Waitangi 1840 between some Maori Tribes in New Zealand and the British Crown).

In our view it is vital that we ensure that the “voice” of the environment is heard and acted on, and that the CBD should not be focused on only human interests. Thus we consider that the interests of the environment itself must be incorporated into the decisions and targets, and that any reference to the future, should encompass all natural systems and components and indigenous biota, not simply the interests of future humans.

We have a long standing interest in and engagement with the systems, institutions, incentives and drivers of activities and impacts on the environment and with appropriate public policy responses as well as international agreements and community and individual responsibilities.

ECO has long been involved in thinking and action to protect and restore native biodiversity and to tackle the threats to it. We above all want private actions and public policy responses and law that is effective, timely, efficient, fair.

ECO is a member of the International Union for the Conservation of Nature, IUCN, and recommends that the knowledge tools of IUCN including the revised classifications of Protected Areas, Nature based solutions, the Red list of threatened species and the Green list of healthy ecosystems be taken into account in the work and design of the Post-Aichi Global BioDiversity Targets.targets. See iucn.org.ch for access to knowledge resources, policies and papers. The Department of Conservation is the New Zealand State Party to IUCN, while ECO, Forest and Bird and various other New Zealand NGOs are also members in their own right.

ECO regrets we registered the chance for input to the CBD later than we should have. Thus we have done this submission in some haste and have received more input than we have been able to accommodate here.

We will continue to try to follow this issue (amongst many) and would be grateful

If you wish to discuss any element of this submission, please email [eco@eco.org.nz](mailto:eco@eco.org.nz) AND [Cath.Wallace10@gmail.com](mailto:Cath.Wallace10@gmail.com) with a contact number and we will call you back.

**The Urgent Need for Action**

**ECO** draws the CBD’s attention to the statement of IUCN, the International Union of the Conservation of Nature, which world organization comprises both governments and non-government organisations and six expert commissions and a secretariat.

In their August 2018 statement IUCN said:

**1. The conservation imperative and the need for transformational change**

The conservation imperative is more urgent than ever. Biodiversity loss continues; the *Earth’s sixth mass extinction* is so severe that humanity must take measures to address the decimation of biodiversity immediately. Conservation actions are having significant impacts in reducing this loss, but are not yet implemented at sufficient scale to stabilise and ultimately reverse current trends. The loss of biodiversity leads to loss of ecosystem services and loss of livelihoods and human wellbeing. The severe consequences for humanity of biodiversity loss are a hidden terror already prevalent but rarely understood by society.

It is particularly sobering to reflect that over the last decade, despite commitment by the world’s governments that “By 2020 the extinction of known threatened species has been prevented” in Aichi Target 12 of the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011–2020, The IUCN Red List of Threatened Species documents that five global extinctions have occurred. ……”

To secure life on Earth, we need bold, new and transformative action, underpinned by sound science and effective policy. It is now incumbent on all to support the leadership role that the Convention on Biological Diversity must take to match the challenge with a comprehensive and achievable framework of action.

The process adopted for the development of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework needs **to allow substantive content to be introduced. Equally, it must reflect the need for its content to achieve the transformational change to achieve the 2050 Vision for biodiversity**. (ECO’s emphasis). [iucn\_views\_on\_post\_2020\_biodiversity\_framework\_-\_august\_2018.pdf]

**The new Vision for 2030 and 2050 and interim Steps**

ECO endorses the Strategic Plan and Vision for 2050 and its goal of a world “Living in Harmony with nature” and the goal that “By 2050 biodiversity is valued, conserved, restored and wisely used, maintaining ecosystems services, sustaining a healthy planet and delivering benefits essential for all people.” We do hope though that all this can be achieved much earlier. 2050 will be far too late for many species and ecosystems. Transformational change is urgent.

Essential to this Vision and Goal will be that earth’s bio-geophysical systems are healthy and functional. This includes biodiversity but also the Earth’s biophysical systems (climate, oceanic currents and salinity, ocean ph, the stability of the polar ice caps, and that Earth’s biological and atmospheric limits are not exceeded. We are woefully short of that situation as has been demonstrated by Rockstrom and many others since.

Avoidance of further losses of biodiversity and recovery of species, ecosystem and genetic diversity will depend on a range of different actions. These closely tie to action to reduce greenhouse gas emissions, reducing climate change drivers to zero net emissions, actions to protect ocean systems and the harms to the environment form other human actions.

We agree with IUCN’s statement here on a Mission for 2030, and its proposal for time limited action “which should be ambitious, succinct, positively framed, action oriented, bold and quotable” (section 4). Moreover, as IUCN suggests, these should tie in closely to the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) and have measurable, separable by nation, sector, and elements of biodiversity (genetic diversity, species and ecosystems) targets and strategies.

We note that in the time available, in the edits to the existing targets that we have made below, we have not managed to be particularly succinct, but we thought it best to convey meaning, content and the “how” as well as the “what” where we could.

We endorse the IUCN emphasis that “the Mission must express necessity as well as feasibility”.

Like IUCN, we also agree that the underlying causes of biodiversity loss must be addressed and we agree with the five strategic goals articulated in the Aichi targets.

**Transformational Change and re-setting our paradigms, embracing responsibility,**

The CBD Discussion paper

We are grateful for the discussion paper and the summaries of the points made, many of which mirror our own views, but we have not been able to catch up with all the various views and options in the discussions.

We place the questions that you pose below, along with some of our views.

A. Structure of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework

11. 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 others have 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?

Either will work but the current structure of the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity will work but specificity and linkages will be essential elements.

B. Ambition of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework

12. 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” targets must start from where we need to get to and to then work back from 2050 in decadal and sub-decadal intervals to get to the goals that will achieve the recovery of natural biodiversity and biophysical systems that support it. It is not sufficient to work from where we are now, because that will obscure the goals –and to achieve the goals, some of them will need to be achieved before 2050 – e.g., having zero extinctions.

The task then is to work out the steps required at each time bound milestone to achieve the goals.

We simply can’t make only incremental change –we must achieve transformation and using the present as our benchmark cannot achieve that change.

C. 2050 Vision for Biodiversity

13. 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?

**The new Vision for 2030 and 2050 and interim Steps**

ECO endorses the Strategic Plan and Vision for 2050 and its goal of a world “Living in Harmony with nature” and the goal that “By 2050 biodiversity is valued, conserved, restored and wisely used, maintaining ecosystems services, sustaining a healthy planet and delivering benefits essential for all people.” We do hope though that all this can be achieved much earlier. 2050 will be far too late for many species and ecosystems. Transformational change is urgent.

Essential to this Vision and Goal will be that earth’s bio-geophysical systems are healthy and functional. This includes biodiversity but also the Earth’s biophysical systems (climate, oceanic currents and salinity, ocean ph, the stability of the polar ice caps, and that Earth’s biological and atmospheric limits are not exceeded. We are woefully short of that situation as has been demonstrated by Rockstrom and many others since.

Avoidance of further losses of biodiversity and recovery of species, ecosystem and genetic diversity will depend on a range of different actions. These closely tie to action to reduce greenhouse gas emissions, reducing climate change drivers to zero net emissions, actions to protect ocean systems and the harms to the environment form other human actions.

We agree with IUCN’s statement here on a Mission for 2030, and its proposal for time limited action “which should be ambitious, succinct, positively framed, action oriented, bold and quotable” (section 4). Moreover, as IUCN suggests, these should tie in closely to the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) and have measurable, separable by nation, sector, and elements of biodiversity (genetic diversity, species and ecosystems) targets and strategies.

We note that in the time available, in the edits to the existing targets that we have made below, we have not managed to be particularly succinct, but we thought it best to convey meaning, content and the “how” as well as the “what” where we could.

We endorse the IUCN emphasis that “the Mission must express necessity as well as feasibility”.

Like IUCN, we also agree that the underlying causes of biodiversity loss must be addressed and we agree with the five strategic goals articulated in the Aichi targets.

**Systems thinking and understanding what gets missed out when markets and other systems of production, distribution and consumption are used without controls to limit extraction, impacts and environmental and social harms.**

In our view though, these need to be set in the context of planetary system limits and boundaries, social justice and the inherent inadequacy of relying on markets to protect what are primarily systems that deliver both private goods and non-excludable public goods (to use environmental economic jargon for distinguishing what markets can and can’t handle).

This requires substantial changes in thinking to systems thinking and revision of our economic goals and systems. This needs to be reflected in the new Global Biodiversity Targets and framework.

“Growth” is often preached, but so often, that which is to be grown is glossed over.

Growth of well being, happiness and of satisfaction, can continue, but not inputs and outputs, impacts and inequality.

This requires a shift from gaining greater satisfaction from private consumption to more emphasis on shared (non-rival) consumption, often in non-extractive ways consumption and production.

Greater public investment in the protection of nature for its own sake and for the non-rival and non-excludable benefits of nature is needed, including ecosystem services, its resilience and its authenticity for science, for experience and for its own survival.

**Biodiversity and values - Anthropocentrism**

Biodiversity systems, components and attributes losses are a loss to all life on earth, not only to humans. The fact that the health and functioning of these underpin human well-being is worth pointing out, but it should not obscure that human wellbeing is only one of the criteria that should be thought about, and the temporal dimensions – what there is now, what is lost and what might be there in the future, need to be in the picture. All life depends on it.

One of the problems with the language of many of the statements made about Biodiversity, is the focus on it for human needs alone – which is not to dispute humans do need it and do need benefits from it

It would be helpful if we could move to language that is more encompassing of nature and does not automatically privilege humans with language that imply human “rights” to nature. Language such as “benefiting nature”, and “benefiting the future” rather than the frequent anthropocentric “future generations” is to be preferred. Similarly, “earth’s” rather than “our” biodiversity lessens the human sense of entitlement and diminishes anthropocentrism.

**Changing our framing of public and personal goals**

One of the most important elements to the Vision, Mission and the targets is that these are framed not simply as for human interest, but also to make it clear that we have responsibilities to the future of the planet and its inhabitants, human and otherwise. Thus, references to “for future generations” should be reframed as “for the future”.

As well as this, we need to revise our personal and public goals. Broadening the human well-being thinking to include social, cultural, environmental and economic wellbeing is very welcome, and may encompass the health of the environment and of biodiversity, but it remains profoundly human-centric.

One conceptualization of the human wellbeing and natural limits relationship is Kate Raworth’s “Doughnut” , that recognises biophysical limits, following Rockstrom et al and others since, but recognizes the pursuit of constrained social foundations. Raworth is from the Oxford University Environmental Change Institute and also Cambridge University.

Relevant graphic and animations can be seen at [https://www.kateraworth.com/doughnut/#](https://www.kateraworth.com/doughnut/)

As Kate Raworth puts it,

“The environmental ceiling consists of nine planetary boundaries, as set out by [Rockstrom et al](http://www.nature.com/news/specials/planetaryboundaries/index.html), beyond which lie unacceptable environmental degradation and potential tipping points in Earth systems. The twelve dimensions of the social foundation are derived from internationally agreed minimum social standards, as identified by the world’s governments in the Sustainable Development Goals in 2015. Between social and planetary boundaries lies an environmentally safe and socially just space in which humanity can thrive.”

In the time available, we were not able to provide a clear version of Dr Rowarth’s paper nor the correct reference, but we know that this work, Rockstrom’s , the work of the MEA other similar work about limits, losses and behaviour change are well known to the CBD and many of the Parties and staff.



Kate Raworth, 2017, at Oxfam’s site, oxfamblogs.org, but see also versions with overshoot marked on at <https://www.google.com/search?q=doughnut+economics+image&tbm=isch&tbs=rimg:CbRSpmh75evzIjjt77VUFImnaj5hjBLdCWlsc5Ort2vuXdHeBgxak_1fRgEGXdjDT-vKqSaYmgDm7ouFWMxBgdLi_1vioSCe3vtVQUiadqEalJyQdPy6N1KhIJPmGMEt0JaWwRJz2vIA0oT6oqEglzk6u3a-5d0RFUVb2mvvkZjyoSCd4GDFqT99GAERHlWYo1sxrBKhIJQZd2MNP68qoR2faud1Jxz3AqEglJpiaAObui4RHd4nBW3Fz05SoSCVYzEGB0uL--ERXMHjhAIl9H&tbo=u&sa=X&ved=2ahUKEwjsn7Cz8KvhAhVWWX0KHdDGDQ8Q9C96BAgBEBs&biw=1106&bih=566&dpr=2#imgrc=VjMQYHS4v76MVM>:

A critical element of understanding these limits is that they are system limits with tipping points and the potential both for wasting and thinning of biodiversity, loss of resilience and also for abrupt changes that are poorly understood. BioDiversity is under heavy pressure with the changes and losses are ubiquitos and profound.

There are numerous drivers of loss, some of these are direct destruction such as over fishing and hunting, others are reactions to impacts on biophysical systems such as ocean acidification, marine current freshening and hence disturbce and disruption of global ocean current systems and hence changes to nutrient distribution within the marine environment.

D. Mission

14. 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?

We congratulate those who came up with the “Living in harmony with nature” line. The communications strategy is not our forte. We attach the set of re-formulations of the Aichi Targets that we came up with – and hope you can find these useful.

E. Biodiversity Targets

15. 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:

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

The “r” in SMART, “realistic”, is problematic. The difficulty is that “reaslism” is likely to be used to reject necessary changes and paradigmatic and system shifts.

For years, ECO, as part of the Antarctic and Southern Ocean Coalition, pressed for the protection of Antarctica from minerals extraction. We were constantly told by officials, diplomats and others that while they understood we were idealistic, they had to be realistic, and so could not support the ambition of having no minerals activity (apart from science) in Antarctica.

With persistence, organization, analysis and determination, a huge public campaign was built and the proposed Antarctic minerals regime was dumped in favour of an Environmental Protocol to the Antarctic Treaty.

We know that there may be efforts to undo the indefinite ban on minerals activity in Antarctica, but we also know that it was achieved and will almost certainly hold well beyond 2048, the earliest that any Antarctic Treaty Party can even begin to propose it being dropped.

Many of the officials and former ministers who patronized us at the time have since accepted that it was not only “realistic” but eminently sensible – much more so than mining Antarctica – particularly for fossil fuels.

The purpose of this account is to illustrate that what is realistic is a matter of imagination, will, adaptability and determination. Not using fossil fuels and shifting our sense of possibilities and necessities is a far better strategy than mining in Antarctica. Our counter was always that “oil and ice don’t mix”. We can add now to that, that oil and the climate, oil and biodiversity don’t mix, and the more we ignore those truths, the more we lock in irreversible social and environmental damage, misery and costs.

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

This is easier to answer in specifics than in general, so in many respects it will be a case of retaining the Aichi targets but adapting some, elaborating them, and adding or amending them. More specific mapping of biodiversity targets onto each SDG is also needed.

This is a constrained optimization problem. This will require care to achieve the necessary natural biodiversity goals and to map the options for protecting biodiversity and ensuring that any use is sustainable onto the SDGs.

Fundamentally, we must change paradigms, while at the same time creating an understanding of the positives of using nature-based solutions within bio-physical limits, and to change our understanding of the evidence of what actually makes people satisfied and having well-being. A shift from consumption of private goods, once a satificing level of consumption is achieved, and towards enhancing well being via the benefits of non-rival and especially non-excludable benefits, is needed.

When social attitudes move to condemn over-consumption and favour genuine sustainability, and we recognise the gains to all from maintaining the planet and biodiversity intact and from social justice and less inequality, we will be a long way towards our goals of humans being in harmony with nature (and each other).

Really the answer to your questions requires a matrix to map the objectives of each agreements onto each other.

# The Aichi Biodiversity Targets – Proposed Amendments

Although many of the targets have NOT been met, there has been some progress on some or all of them. Like IUCN, we consider these targets need to be updated and made to be more specific as to substance and measures and reporting. IUCN observes that those targets with measurable and attributable elements tend to be better acted on than those that are vague or diffuse. (<https://www.iucn.org/sites/dev/files/content/documents/iucn_-inputs_for_preparations_of_the_post_2020_strategic_plan_sept_2017.pdf>)

We also agree with IUCN that the post-2020 Targets should be mapped onto the Sustainable Development Goals, and that each country should provide a proposed voluntary plan and commitments mapped onto each of the Targets.

**Stretch Targets**

The new Targets should be “Stretch” targets that are ambitious enough to actually achieve the changes that science suggests are needed to slow the rate of biodiversity losses to a halt by 2030 (if biologically feasible) and to foster recovery to targets that are ecologically sound and consistent with the Vision of “people living in harmony with nature” and the goal of “by 2050 biodiversity is valued, conserved, restored and wisely used, maintaining ecosystems services, sustaining a healthy planet and delivering benefits essential for all people.”

We would add “and for the future”.

Several commentators including IUCN, have suggested that the targets need to be ambitious enough effectively to tackle the biodiversity loss crisis, and not simply the lowest common denominator that nations then do not even try to live up to.

The suggestion is to set ambitious targets as voluntary against which progress can be compared.

Another approach is to aim for the minimum needed to make a bit of progress – but we wonder whether this will become the maximum aimed for instead.

**Gaps and lop-sidedness**

The CBD and the new Targets should address gaps in the targets, gaps of ambition by countries as well as gaps of implementation of the means to achieve the targets globally and nationally.

**Topics missing or of insufficient scope now need to be covered.**

**Oceans and Biodiversity**

We consider that Ocean biodiversity is inadequately covered both in the targets and in reality.

Direct impacts from industrial use for mining, dumping and fishing, particularly but not only in the EEZs of countries and for other purposes needs attention. So too does pollution, whether from dumping, plastics, sedimentation, nutrient run-off, or acidification from climate change or other sources.

The UN Biodiversity Beyond National Jurisdiction (BBNJ) negotiations present a good opportunity for more careful protection and management of the high seas but only if countries truly commit to biodiversity protection in this realm of the ocean.

Regional Fisheries Management Organisations such as SPRFMO and its counterparts tend to favour fishing interests over the environment,

and are often very poor at protecting the environment. The recent SPRFMO decision to allow large “catches” of biodiversity and resistance to the move-on rule when vulnerable marine ecosystems are encountered is an unhappy case in point.

The Convention on the Conservation of Antarctic Marine Living Resources is perhaps the oldest marine regional environmental management regime that has ecosystem based management at its heart. This contains many good principles and measures. Its Achilles heel is the consensus rule, so that Russia and China can and too often do, block progress. The CBD is different in that it is focused on binding or non-binding recommendations for nations – so the governance is fundamentally different.

The International Whaling Commission can also help with biodiversity protection – the more so now that Japan is restricting its whaling to its own EEZ.

Numerous other international agreements and their implementation have a role to play in protecting marine biodiversity. It will be important for the CBD and its members to take the biodiversity protection measure to these bodies too – the IMO, various science bodies, the Dumping Convention, various anti-pollution agreements, and so on.

The Paris Agreement on Climate Change relate to greenhouse gas emissions – but biodiversity measures must provide space and protection to allow biodiversity resilience in the face of the bio-physical disruptions that rising greenhouse gas emissions engender.

**Space for Nature**

IUCN makes a cogent argument for the revised targets to make clear reference to requirements for Targets to be set to allow “space for nature”.

We also need targets for specific species, but at this level, the reference will have to be to the various categories of threaten species and endangered species, the planet’s biodiversity will never flourish if we wait for species to reach these depressingly long lists before we provide for them.

Providing space for nature is an essential part of this. We directly address this matter in the sections below.

**Education, creation of pro-natural biodiversity social norms and behaviours**

Reflecting on New Zealand experience, teaching children about biodiversity – terrestrial, freshwater or marine, and taking people to rock pools and marine reserves or lakes and rivers, forests etc, is one potent form of getting people to care about and understand native biodiversity. This requires access to these places or some proxy of them.

The movements in New Zealand for weed busting, restoration, predator control and so on are more and more creating a social norm, just as the norm is now well established that you don’t wear the skins of wild animals. The norm against big game hunting is strong in much of New Zealand and elsewhere, but there remain many places where such activity is well accepted and even advocated for conservation funding. The New Zealand situation of discouraging big game hunting heroes seems not to apply to those who catch fish.

**International and national law**

Developing environmental law and understandings of the harms to biodiversity suggests that we need deeper and more effective institutions and laws to protect biodiversity.

New Zealand’s designation of “guardians” or kaitiaki for entities of nature such as particular rivers given legal entity status, is one approach, albeit specific not generic.

Specific planning and environmental laws can and do help with providing protection, and should be part of each nation’s apparatus to guide and if need be to enforce environmental protection including biodiversity protection.

Some countries are less able than others to resist the pressures on them or their decision makers to allow industrial scale damage to biodiversity. This may be direct logging, damming, fishing, polluting and other such.

An internationally recognised shift of discourse from “rights” to human “responsibilities” is needed to shift from “rights to take” to “responsibilities to protect” is recommended.

The crime of “ecocide” is one that should be established in both national and particularly, international law for those who undertake environmentally damaging activities on a major scale. This is the analogue to genocide. Such crimes as allowing pollution of significant natural areas, basing and/or conducting a business on destruction of habitat, or other such activities would be within scope of “ecocide”.

We note the desire to keep the Targets “positive” but also the persistence of harmful business and consumption practices. We recommend that the CBD and member states develop and adopt the judicial description and understanding and hard law on ecocide.

**Ecotypes, Sectoral targets**

ECO thinks it would be helpful for biodiversity targets and strategy to set sectoral targets and also ecologically define place and pathway targets. This then allows those living or acting in particular ecotypes or sectors – eg transport, forestry etc, to see how the targets are set for them.

We have not had the time to consider what these should be, but we agree with IUCN that such an approach would aid achievement of the goals and targets.

**The cryosphere**

We notice that the biodiversity of polar regions and other icey areas tend to be overlooked in biodiversity discussions. These tend to be heavily affected, particularly by climate change, and to be so adapted to their extreme environments that they lack resilience when things change. We would like to see more attention to this area.

**Access to nature and nature-based solutions**

The CBD focuses on reasons to protect and restore biodiversity as well as the protection targets. We think it is worth drawing on the science of the benefits of biodiversity to human health and the basis of nature based solutions to global and local problems, as IUCN puts it.

**The Strategic Goals**

* [Strategic Goal A](https://www.cbd.int/sp/targets/default.shtml#GoalA): Address the underlying causes of biodiversity loss by mainstreaming biodiversity across government and society.
* [Strategic Goal B](https://www.cbd.int/sp/targets/default.shtml#GoalB): Reduce the direct pressures on biodiversity and promote sustainable use
* [Strategic Goal C](https://www.cbd.int/sp/targets/default.shtml#GoalC): To improve the status of biodiversity by safeguarding ecosystems, species and genetic diversity
* [Strategic Goal D](https://www.cbd.int/sp/targets/default.shtml#GoalD): Enhance the benefits to all from biodiversity and ecosystem services
* [Strategic Goal E](https://www.cbd.int/sp/targets/default.shtml#GoalE): Enhance implementation through participatory planning, knowledge management and capacity building

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| ***Strategic Goal A: Address the underlying causes of biodiversity loss by mainstreaming biodiversity across government and society*** | |
| This | **Strategic Goal A** needs to be clearer as to what “mainstreaming” biodiversity means, and also to refer to how allowing biodiversity to recover is vital because it is irreplaceable and harm is often irrevocable.  In this section, we have used underline to suggest additions, and strikeout to suggest deletions.  **Target 1**  By 2030, at the latest, people are aware of the values of biodiversity for its own sake and to life, and that losses are often system losses, irreversible at some point, and that biodiversity is non-substitutable. Such awareness is translated into behaviour so that they adopt pro-natural biodiversity attitudes and behaviours as a social norm and that they are aware of the steps they can take to conserve and ~~use it sustainably~~ **ensure that any use of it is sustainable**.  NOTE: There is an inherent ambiguity about the language of ‘promoting (or variants of that) sustainable use”. It can be understood a promoting use, rather than its original intended meaning of ensuring that any use is sustainable. ECO understands that “sustainable use” is commonly adopted language in the CBD and elsewhere, but we think it is high time we all stopped promoting use, and focused on ensuring that any use is sustainable.  In New Zealand, we have managed to make predator control a “hot topic” and social movement. The Biosecurity 2025 programme is designed to engage the whole community (a biosecurity team of 4.7 million) and all sectors, including community members and groups, businesses especially those that may be vectors or affected, transport systems participants (airlines, ports), experts, regional and central government, and so on. Making biosecurity a social norm and a habit is a goal of this programme. Perhaps we can make creating social norms about biodiversity protection should be a specific part of this target? |
|  | **Target 2**  By 2020, at the latest, biodiversity values and the need for their protection have been addressed by public policy and private practice, and integrated into national and local development and poverty reduction strategies and planning processes and are being incorporated into national accounting, as appropriate, and reporting systems.  It is essential that the above and the monitoring and reporting systems and accounting do NOT assume:  1 That biodiversity’s value is primarily for humans; or  2 That biodiversity is re-creatable, is substitutable or fungible in the sense of qualitatively the same as dollar values, though accounting for the value to people is reasonable with caveats.  3 Native biodiversity must be distinguished from non-native. Invasive species need to be documented and distinguished for separate treatment.  The fact that native biodiversity has far greater significance than introduced or “gardened” systems, needs recognition and actions to match.  The authenticity of natural systems, the irreversibility and non-substitutability of many aspects of biodiversity losses, and the impoverishment of genetic stock and ecosystem function and range should be registered and understood. This means there must be some form of requirements to reflect these characteristics in this integration into development, planning and strategies, as well as into national (or other level) accounting and reporting.  As noted above, Daniel Simberloff puts the case thus:  “It is misguided and potentially disastrous to consider native and non-native species as equal from the standpoint of both ecosystem services and conservation goals, including the Aichi Targets of the CBD and UN Sustainable Development Goals. The reasons are elaborated in a [recent article](https://journals.plos.org/plosbiology/article?id=10.1371/journal.pbio.2006686" \t "_blank) by 26 invasion scientists from around the world, ..” [12/12/2018, https://www.iucn.org/crossroads-blog/201812/do-non-native-species-count-biodiversity] |
|  | **Target 3**  By 2030, at the latest, incentives, including subsidies, harmful to biodiversity are eliminated, phased out or reformed in order to minimize or avoid negative impacts, and positive measures including incentives for the conservation ~~and sustainable use~~ of biodiversity and transitional measures to ensure that any use is sustainable are developed and applied, consistent and in harmony with the Convention and other relevant international obligations, taking into account national socio economic conditions. |
|  | ECO considers that we need to do better than simply phasing out subsidies that are harmful to biodiversity and providing incentives to conserve, albeit these are needed. “Minimisation” is too weak.  We must also stop treating harming biodiversity as business as usual and a free good, whether it is organisations clearing tropical rainforest for palm planning and harvesting, mining companies bullying their way into protected areas, or industrial fishers using trawl gear and other methods that are known to be destructive of benthic communities.  Public environmental assessments of method impacts, disincentives and penalties are needed for those who damage biodiversity, particularly the industrial players.  For smaller players, it will be essential to provide for a transition to any use being sustainable. We have inserted “measures” to allow for the changing of practice, social norms, regulatory measures and other policy instruments.  **Target 4**  By 2030, at the latest, Governments, business and stakeholders at all levels have taken steps to achieve zero further loss of biodiversity or have implemented plans for transitions of uses and practices in using nature to reduce impacts of production and consumption to zero biodiversity loss and have kept the impacts of any use of natural resources and other human activities well within safe biophysical and ecological limits.  The purpose of these changes is to recognise that “sustainable production and consumption” is too vague, and that a more exact target is needed. Impacts of human activities, not solely the impacts of the use of particular natural resources, need to be considered. Thus the release of potentially invasive species, the greenhouse gas emissions of production and consumption and practices such as dumping need to be considered, as well as direct impacts of say, soil use, trawling or whatever is being considered. |
| ***Strategic Goal B: Reduce the direct pressures on biodiversity and promote that any use is sustainable. ~~use~~*** | |
|  | |

As above, ECO recommends a transition to the language of “that any use is sustainable” though we understand that the language of the Convention has to be observed at times.

|  |
| --- |
| **Target 5**  By 2030, the rate of loss of all natural habitats, including but not limited to forests, grass lands, estuarine and wetlands areas, those in ice regions (the cryosphere), desert, wetlands, freshwater and marine ecosystems and urban areas is at least halved until a halt in losses is achieved.. Further, that plans, rules and resources are in place and implemented to stop biodiversity losses and for recovery of the extent, range and functionality of biodiversity in all its components are in place, ~~feasible brought close to zero~~, Degradation and fragmentation is significantly reduced and reversed without generating perverse incentives.  Our rationale for this is that there is no reason to mention forests but not other kinds of habitat. We notice few recognise the extraordinary habitats even within rocks and ice of the polar and other icey areas of the world. Deserts, a range of marine ecosystems and many others are also frequently overlooked. Native habitats in urban areas are also increasingly recognised as vital for both biodiversity and for human health.  We have added text to provide for regulatory and other measures. |
| **Target 6**  By 2030 that all marine harvesting is managed along (genuine) biodiversity health criteria to maintain abundance, range and biodiversity health including ecosystem functions and natural genetic diversity. That all such harvesting is undertaken legally, applying ecosystem based and environmentally precautionary approaches, so that overfishing is avoided, recovery plans and measures are in place and implemented, monitored and reported for all depleted species. Fisheries have no significant adverse impacts on the environment including but not limited to threatened species and vulnerable ecosystems and the impacts of fisheries on both target and bycatch stocks, and other associated and dependent species and ecosystems are within safe ecological limits. All fish and invertebrate stocks and aquatic plants that are harvested are managed along ecosystem function lines, including environmentally selected method controls, that predator species are managed to at least 50% of their original biomass and that prey species are managed to 75% of their original biomass. |
| New Zealand’s harvest strategy is excessively individual stock-focused, non-precautionary, and should not be used as a guide. Australia’s is rather better, but still insufficiently ecosystem based.  In the following, we explain some meanings in single stock fisheries management. Apologies for strange formatting – we could not purge it.  Bo stands for B zero, the original biomass prior to any fishing.  BMSY means the biomass of the fish stock that would provide for a (usually annual) yield of fish from the “capital” fish stock that maximizes the sustainable yield. This is a harvest focused goal, not an ecosystem goal.  BMEY means the biomass (fish stock) that provides the Maximum economic yield, taking into account the potential of a stock to grow and the costs of harvesting, including any increased costs due to fewer fish being available.  Penney et al (2013) in their review of the Australian harvest strategy suggested a range of best practice approaches would involve higher stock levels:  The target for important forage fish at 75%Bo “to ensure stocks remain large enough to fulfil their ecotrophic functions”;  The proxy for BMSY for shark species may need to be closer to 50% Bo than the current proxy of 40%Bo;  BMEY proxy is more likely to lie in the range of 50-60%Bo.  Concerns about the single species nature of MSY and many harvest reference points have led to consideration of predator and prey relationships.  These ecological relationships have been an important consideration in the Convention for the Conservation of Antarctic Marine Living Resources’s (CCAMLR’s ) approach to fisheries management.  In CCAMLR, target  levels have been set at 50%Bo for predator species  (e.g. toothfish) and 75%Bo for prey species (e.g., krill or icefish)(Constable et al., 2000).    In a review of biological reference points for a number of shark species, Bracinni et al (2015) showed that the biomass target for shark species can exceed 40%Bo and ranged from 46% to 65%Bo depending on the shark species.  This is relevant to consideration of bycatch species in fisheries management - even with the most rudimentary concern for ecosystem-based management.    Smith et al., (2011) noted that  “retaining stocks at higher levels (eg   75%Bo) for low trophic  level species  had lower ecological impacts. They noted that “halving exploitation rates would result in much lower impacts on marine ecosystems while still achieving 80% of MSY”. Further: “Considerable reduction in impacts can be achieved by moving from exploitation at MSY levels (achieved at 60% depletion levels) to a target of 75% of unexploited biomass (25% depletion).”  We need real Ecosystem Based Management (EBM), predator-prey relationships, strategic Enviornmental Assessments (SEAs), Enviornmental and Social impact Assessments.  Marine and other Protected Areas (using IUCN classifications I-IV) and species and ecosystem protections, plus celebrations of healthy ecoystems, are needed.  **Target 7** By 2030 areas under agriculture, horticulture, production forestry, energy production, aquaculture, transport systems and tourist activities are managed sustainably, ensuring conservation of biodiversity. No new harvesting or displacement of native ecosystems for crop production, logging, energy production, crop production or aquaculture should be permitted on any industrial scale. Biodiversity must be protected whilst extra production should only be permitted where ecosystems and habitat were already modified by 2018.  Land use change is encouraged to protect ecosystems and the climate, but the expansion of the human footprint for industrial scale biological production at the expense of biodiversity should be frozen to 2018 levels. |
| Industrial scale expansion of oil palms, soya production, bio-energy plants and the like can still happen on already modified land. This target is best understood to involve land use changes only on modified land. In the New Zealand Forest Accord, 1991, foresters, timber industry folks and environmental organisations agreed that there would be no clearance for production of exotic forestry on land with native forest species that could be canopy species. Sustainable exotic forestry production was endorsed.  Setting a benchmark of 2018 is designed to avoid strategic behaviour to “beat the gun” by clearing biodiversity to avoid being caught by new rules. It is well established that setting deadlines for change in the future invites perverse outcomes – the opposite of what is intended.  On the consumption side, it is clear that there is huge potential to change the consumption habits of the relatively wealthy while increasing the food available to the undernourished. One key element is to switch toward predominantly plant-based diets. Transitional assistance, assistance with weed and pest control, and ecosystem service payments are encouraged to assist those whose forbearance in maintaining biodiverse areas up to now are not penalized.  **Target 8** By 2030, pollution, including nano particles, plastics, excess nutrients, and other pollutants, has been brought to levels that are not detrimental to species, ecosystem function and biodiversity. Where pollutants already emitted are persistent, measures are taken to prevent their spread and limit the damage they do. |
| We wonder too whether there should be some reference to avoiding antibiotic resistance and some discussion of not contaminating nature with our various medicines?  **Target 9**  By 2030, invasive alien species and pathways are identified and prioritized using each of ecological, economic and social criteria. Systems are put in place to avoid entry, and to control or eradicate those with invasive potential, and to control or eradicate those with potential to harm native biodiversity or with high social, cultural or economic impacts. Measures are in place to manage pathways to prevent their introduction, establishment and persistence. |
| As mentioned above,the authenticity of natural systems, the irreversibility and non-substitutability of many aspects of native biodiversity losses, and the impoverishment of genetic stock and ecosystem function and range should be registered and understood.  As noted above, Daniel Simberloff puts the case thus:  “It is misguided and potentially disastrous to consider native and non-native species as equal from the standpoint of both ecosystem services and conservation goals, including the Aichi Targets of the CBD and UN Sustainable Development Goals. The reasons are elaborated in a [recent article](https://journals.plos.org/plosbiology/article?id=10.1371/journal.pbio.2006686" \t "_blank) by 26 invasion scientists from around the world, but I would like to comment on three particular issues relevant to both ecosystem services and the IUCN mission. [12/12/2018, https://www.iucn.org/crossroads-blog/201812/do-non-native-species-count-biodiversity]  **Target 10**  By ~~2015~~, 2030 the multiple anthropogenic pressures on coral reefs, and other vulnerable ecosystems and species impacted by climate change or ocean acidification are minimized, so as to maintain their integrity and functioning, range, resilience and abundance. |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| ***Strategic Goal C: To improve the status of biodiversity by safeguarding native ecosystems, species and genetic diversity*** | |
|  | **Target 11** By 2030, at least ~~17~~ 30 per cent of terrestrial and inland water, and ~~10~~ 40 per cent of each type of ecosystem and habitat of coastal and marine areas, especially areas of particular importance for biodiversity and ecosystem services, are conserved through effectively and equitably managed, conservation focused, ecologically representative and well connected systems of fully protected areas, and another 15% by other effective area-based conservation measures, and integrated into the wider landscapes and seascapes and their management.  ECO notes that as well as various kinds of marine spatial planning, there is a need for 40% of each ecosystem and habitat to be protected in full and genuine marine protected areas that satisfy IUCN’s Marine Protected Area categories I-IV. We attach as an appendix, IUCN’s guide to these. [IUCN WCPA, 2018. Applying IUCN’s Global Conservation Standards to Marine Protected Areas (MPA). Delivering effective conservation action through MPAs, to secure ocean health & sustainable development. Version 1.0. Gland, Switzerland. 4pp ] |
|  | **Target 12** By 2030 the extinction of known threatened species has been prevented and their conservation status, particularly of those most in decline, has been improved and sustained before genetic diversity and ecosystem functions have been heavily depleted. In respect of other species, management of human impacts has been undertaken according to the precautionary approach in favour of the environment, and information sufficiency tests have been applied. Monitoring, taxonomic capacity and expertise, recording and reporting measures should be in place. |
|  | In the light of the problem of lack of knowledge of threatened species, the precautionary principle and information sufficiency tests prior to activities that might cause harm to biodiversity should be adopted. This is part of the “how” rather than simply “what”.  A provision for monitoring and reporting changes should be adopted here too, and for that, taxonomic capacity and expertise retained – with both scientific and traditional or citizen-based knowledge.  **Target 13**  By 2030, the genetic diversity of cultivated plants and farmed and domesticated animals and of wild relatives, including other socio-economically as well as culturally valuable species, is maintained, and strategies have been developed and implemented for minimizing genetic erosion and safeguarding their genetic diversity, but with priority given to not harming native biodiversity in the process.  Following Simberloff, we consider the hierarchy of native species needs to frame this goal. |
| ***Strategic Goal D: Enhance the benefits to all from biodiversity and ecosystem services*** | |
|  | **Target 14**  By 2030, ecosystems that provide essential services, including services related to water, and contribute to health, livelihoods and well-being, are restored and safeguarded, taking into account the needs of women, indigenous and local communities, and the poor and vulnerable. |
|  | **Target 15** By 2030, ecosystem resilience and the contribution of biodiversity to carbon stocks has been enhanced, through conservation and restoration, including restoration of at least ~~15~~ 50 per cent of degraded ecosystems, thereby contributing to climate change mitigation and adaptation and to combating desertification, hydrological system shifts and failures, ice-melting and collapse, the spread of invasive species and the destabilization of of ocean bio-physical systems. |
|  | **ECO** suggests that a link to reducing greenhouse gas emissions from soils, wetlands etc also be added in here.  **Target 16** By 2020, the Nagoya Protocol on Access to Genetic Resources and the Fair and Equitable Sharing of Benefits Arising from their Utilization is in force and operational, consistent with national legislation.  ECO is unclear what level of progress on this there has been so we make no comment on this. |
| ***Strategic Goal E: Enhance implementation through participatory planning, knowledge management and capacity building*** | |
|  | **Target 17** By 2015 each Party has developed, adopted as a policy instrument, and has commenced implementing an effective, participatory and updated national biodiversity strategy and action plan and that the efficacy of these are assessed, publicly reported and subject to citizen and expert review, and are supported by complementary measures.  ECO notes that sometimes there is a tendency of overstate gains, to “guild the lily”, obscure failures and pass off some failures as successes.  More strategically, reports and critiques of these can help to raise awareness of biodiversity issues, to educate the public and to guide policy and practice. |
|  | **Target 18**  By 2020, the traditional knowledge, innovations and practices of indigenous and local communities relevant for the conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity, and their customary use of biological resources, are respected, subject to avoiding extinctions and serious harm to native biodiversity, national legislation and relevant international obligations, and fully integrated and reflected in the implementation of the Convention with the full and effective participation of indigenous and local communities, at all relevant levels.  Biodiversity is critically important to all humans, and indigenous communities are increasingly given priority or at least ensured participation. The indigeneity of biodiversity also needs priority protection. |
|  | **Target 19** By 2030, knowledge, the science base and technologies relating to biodiversity, its values, functioning, status and trends, and the consequences of its loss, are improved, widely shared, taught and transferred, and applied but not including genetically engineered biodiversity and technologies.  Genetic modification should not be “smuggled in” to this target, which some readings of it could allow. The precautionary principle means that there should be consideration of uncertainties, unknowns and risks, rather than “gung ho” dissemination and application. The ecosystem based management approach and biodiversity risks assessments also should be included here.  We wonder if there should also be a specific provision for education at all levels of school and in other realms? |
|  | **Target 20** By 2020, at the latest, the mobilization of financial resources for effectively implementing the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity ~~2011-2020~~ 2020-2030 and 2030-2050 from all sources, and in accordance with the consolidated and agreed process in the Strategy for Resource Mobilization, should increase substantially from the current levels. This target will be subject to changes contingent to resource needs assessments to be developed and reported by Parties. |

This is difficult for us to judge except that it is clear that not nearly enough investment in biodiversity protection has been done. Methods of conveying savings to health and production of protecting biodiversity and the opportunity costs of not protecting native biodiversity, and sheeting home the costs to those who destroy biodiversity on an industrial scale are needed.

(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?

One of the most important elements to the Vision, Mission and the targets is that these are framed not simply as for human interest, but also to make it clear that we have responsibilities to the future of the planet and its inhabitants, human and otherwise. Thus, references to “for future generations” should be reframed as “for the future”.

Another conceptual shift will be helpful will be to frame discourse at all levels from “rights based” claims to recognise also responsibilities of humans to stay within nature’s limits and to do so within a systems framework.

IUCN, to which ECO belongs but with which we sometimes agree and sometimes disagree, makes a very good point about nature-based solutions to social problems.

F. Voluntary commitments and contributions

16. 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 Commitments should be strictly in addition to mandatory requirements. Biodiversity leaders can then set examples for the rest and the laggards. It is very useful to civil society in less ambitious countries to use the examples of ambitious goals and practical steps to achieve those to demonstrate that there are good examples that can be borrowed from.

Some countries with an overweening sense of autonomy will refuse to sign up to mandatory goals.

We all know that there is a huge amount of passing off of achievement as being greater than it truly is, and that some of the reporting ranges from “gilding the lily” – ie overstating gains made, to fake reporting. New Zealand’s passing off of fishing industry designed marine “benthic protected areas”, commonly known in New Zealand as “bogus protected areas”, as genuine conservation focused marine protected areas is a case in point.

ECO hopes that the current, Labour-led government with Greens ministers, will retreat from such fake reporting by the previous government. Giving civil society and independent auditors, the opportunity and sufficient time to critique Government reporting is an essential quality control tool.

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

17. 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?

We get the problem! The UN Oceans Biodiversty Beyond National Jurisdiction is another case in point, now under development.

The work of the CBD is to help pave the way for the understanding of the urgency of the need to change and how to start changing the paradigms and systems. Essentially, the aim is to agree and advance the goals and to make known the ideas and goals and to give these currency, urgency and to place the need for these all to advance in front of the public. As with several of the existing agreements, there are some common principles such as the precautionary principle and approach, ideas of transparency and participation, of monitoring, reporting and verifying, and the idea of a gear change and shift of strategies and pathways.

The CBD’s work, and that of the Parties and participants, help to shift norms, understanding, attitudes and – with good measures and messaging – also behaviours.

The post 2020 framework and its elements needs to set the scene, but also to chart what we need to do by when, the benefits of achieving flourishing and abundant within original ranges natural biodiversity, and pathways from the desired futures to the present.

The scope of the CBD’s work has to map onto the drivers for losses of bioidiversity. This does not mean that the post 2020 biodiversity work has to do all the heavy lifting. Some of the work can be folded into the on-going work of other agreements and conventions.

H. Mainstreaming

18. 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?

Mainstreaming can be done in many ways. In New Zealand we are working on a Biosecurity 2025 implementation programme. This has in scope pre-border, border, and post border including eradication and control of invasive species.

The New Zealand government is also consulting on and developing

In this programme there are several strands relating to free flowing information, technology and tools, capacity building and various other strands. Notably, one strand is to engage all New Zealanders in biosecurity – a biosecurity team of 4.7 million (i.e. the population of New Zealanders). There are many proposed actions, but mainstreaming the issue of biosecurity and invasive species across New Zealand with all industries and relevant civil society groups, experts, Maori community etc, is the goal. For this, we have chosen to try to invigorate and connect networks of networks. For more on this plan, see <https://www.thisisus.nz/assets/Resources/163e2a594e/Biosecurity_2025_implementation_plan_full_version.pdf>

Clearly, on an international scale, mainstreaming is more complicated, but since the CBD works through nations as well as via international processes, some of the principles and approaches may be the same.

In relation to the CBD-SDG intersections, many of the social and economic goals rely on the health of biodiversity and the geophysical systems.

I. Relationship with the current Strategic Plan

19. 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?

The CBD processes and the Aichi targets are not well-known in New Zealand. Even the name gives no hint to the ordinary citizen as to what this is all about. We suggest that rather than use place names, the titles be topic-revealing, so that people can understand and engage.

Where should additional attention be focused?

Additional attention must be given to the biodiversity of the marine environment; the cryosphere and the extraordinary life and ecosystems that fit within the icey regions including but not limited to the poles; and to the astonishing microbiomes in the ocean and in species and individuals.

**Invasive Species**

Other impacts relate to invasive species, and are of particular signifiance to New Zealand. We have leading expertise in this area relating to pre-border, border , and internal biosecurity and invasive species control.

Invasive speies may spread deliberately for commerical or social reasons – such as the introduction of crop species or biological control species to protect crops, as with New Zealand’s EPA’s approval of the import of New Organisms, or the capture of songbirds in Asia for the purpose of demonstrating status.

Other imports and spread of invasive species is inadvertant, or propelled by wind or water as with the introduction and spread of myrtle rust and Kauri die-back.

Daniel Simberloff, Gore Hunger Professor of Environmental Studies at the University of Tennessee and member of the Invasive Species Specialist Group of IUCN’s Species Survival Commission, critiques and rejects suggestions in the press and in scientific literature, that alien species (i.e. non-natives) should be regarded as just as important as native species. As he puts it in an open letter to all IUCN members,

“It is misguided and potentially disastrous to consider native and non-native species as equal from the standpoint of both ecosystem services and conservation goals, including the Aichi Targets of the CBD and UN Sustainable Development Goals. The reasons are elaborated in a [recent article](https://journals.plos.org/plosbiology/article?id=10.1371/journal.pbio.2006686" \t "_blank) by 26 invasion scientists from around the world, but I would like to comment on three particular issues relevant to both ecosystem services and the IUCN mission. [12/12/2018, https://www.iucn.org/crossroads-blog/201812/do-non-native-species-count-biodiversity]

**International and national law**

Developing environmental law and understandings of the harms to biodiversity suggests that we need deeper and more effective institutions and laws to protect biodiversity.

New Zealand’s designation of “guardians” or kaitiaki for entities of nature such as particular rivers given legal entity status, is one approach, albeit specific not generic.

Specific planning and environmental laws can and do help with providing protection, and should be part of each nation’s apparatus to guide and if need be to enforce environmental protection including biodiversity protection.

Some countries are less able than others to resist the pressures on them or their decision makers to allow industrial scale damage to biodiversity. This may be direct logging, damming, fishing, polluting and other such.

An internationally recognised shift of discourse from “rights” to human “responsibilities” is needed to shift from “rights to take” to “responsibilities to protect” is recommended.

The crime of “ecocide” is one that should be established in both national and particularly, international law for those who undertake environmentally damaging activities on a major scale. This is the analogue to genocide. Such crimes as allowing pollution of significant natural areas, basing and/or conducting a business on destruction of habitat, or other such activities would be within scope of “ecocide”.

We note the desire to keep the Targets “positive” but also the persistence of harmful business and consumption practices. We recommend that the CBD and member states develop and adopt the judicial description and understanding and hard law on ecocide.

K. Indicators

20. 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?

This is important but we do not have sufficient capacity at the moment to contribute to this.

L. Implementation and NBSAPs

21. Many submissions noted the need to emphasize implementation in the post-2020 global biodiversity framework. ECO agrees.

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. ECO agrees

Further many submissions noted the need for additional mechanisms to support implementation. ECO agrees

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?

On the question of the mechanisms and tools to support implementation, some form of (non-collusive) review teams that go in country and examine the successes, lessons, veracity, civil society and expert critiques of national reports would be a good idea. The current process of opening up national reports for comments to wider society is an important element, but the OECD, for instance, sends teams of officials from other member countries to assess progress on issues. They read national reports, then spend a week or so meeting with the government and others and can (but don’t always) draw from these, useful lessons and examples of success, and also listen to critiques and make comments on needed changes.

Independent peer reviews will be resisted by some governments, but it has been a good lesson sharing method and has also provided some very helpful and much needed avenues for quality control. We notice that sometimes governments within the OECD process give civil society very little notice of the process, of meeting times, or of the issues of interest to the review team. Such matters would need close specification to make the process effective and inclusive.

M. Resource mobilization

22. 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?

ECO considers this important, but as a poorly resourced national ENGO, we do not have the capacity to make suggestions on this at the moment.

N. Financial mechanisms

23. Decision 14/23 welcomes the 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?

Perhaps give more publicity and kudos to those who contribute, and also publicly report those who don’t so that civil society can make virtuous or odious comparisons as the case may be?

O. Review process

24. 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?

As in our response above, re 21, on the question of the mechanisms and tools to support implementation, some form of (non-collusive) review teams that go in country and examine the successes, lessons, veracity, civil society and expert critiques of national reports would be a good idea. The current process of opening up national reports for comments to wider society is an important element, but the OECD, for instance, sends teams of officials from other member countries to assess progress on issues. They read national reports, then spend a week or so meeting with the government and others and can (but don’t always) draw from these, useful lessons and examples of success, and also listen to critiques and make comments on needed changes.

This process will be resisted by some governments, but it has been a good lesson sharing method and has also provided some very helpful and much needed avenues for quality control.

P. Relationship between the Convention and the Protocols

25. 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?

Modified organisms control should operate not only in relation to the precautionary principle but also it should shift the single purpose commercial and short term benefits attitude to longer term considerations and effects on natural biodiversity and ecosystems.

26. 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?

We support fairness but we do not support the approach that natural biodiversity is essentially human property. To continue to frame biodiversity in this way is to continue one of the main sources of the problem.

Q. Integrating diverse perspectives

27. 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:

(a) 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?

New Zealand is starting to mainstream traditional framing of issues and knowledge into tackling problems with biodiversity and biosecurity, in several aspects including science, practice, holistic approaches etc.

Sometimes the priority of indigenous people is used as a battering ram for access by industrial interests fronted by indigenous people to access natural resources and biodiversity.

It is important to establish that indigenous biodiversity has even stronger indigeneity claims than people, indigenous or otherwise, so should not be framed in an anthropocentric way and should not be regarded as open to abuse.

(b) 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?

This is important but we have limited capacity to respond to this.

(c) 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?

This is important but we have limited capacity to respond to this.

(d) 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?

This is important. A mix of regional and national consultations but also funding to enable civil society groups that have limited resources – and not only those in low income developing countries – can actually attend some of the international meetings.

(e) 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?

This is important but we have limited capacity to respond to this. Youth could be asked to make video clips, develop projects and plans via educational organisations, competitions, and via interviewing elders and reporting on their perceptions of biodiversity declines and recoveries.

(f) 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?

There are huge difficulties with the private sector having a major voice and influence within the CBD, because money and wealth already give some of them much more influence than is democratically sound.

They do have to be brought into discussions but it could be in dialogue with civil society and others.

28. 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?

This is important but we have limited capacity to respond to this.

We suggest that there be scope for people in the groups and diverse views to help develop the targets and framework and have a range of interactive sessions to develop elements which are then open to critique by others within their category and by a broader process as well.

R. Communication and outreach

29. 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 YES

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?

IUCN’s regional meetings and World Congress can help to give the issues some recognition amongst its members.

The arts and online systems are obviously important elements.

Help to civil society organisations who want to debate these issues could help to catalyse discussions within existing forums and other events.

This is important but we have limited capacity to respond to this.

**Finally**

We are grateful to be invited to submit. We would like to be more involved and more informed of the work that has gone on. We would like to have come up with some more specifics. Our resources are limited.

ECO wishes you well and all speed in this endeavour and would like to be included in on-going processes.

Yours sincerely,

Catherine Wallace,

Co-chair, ECO

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_
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POST-2020 GLOBAL BIODIVERSITY FRAMEWORK: DISCUSSION PAPER

Note by the Executive Secretary

I. BACKGROUND

1. In decision 14/34, the Conference of the Parties to the Convention on Biological Diversity adopted a comprehensive and participatory process for the preparation of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework. The process requires that an initial discussion document summarizing and analysing the initial views of Parties and observers be made available in January 2019. Accordingly, the present document has been prepared, with the guidance of the co-chairs of the Open-ended Intersessional Working Group to Support the Preparation of the Post-2020 Global Biodiversity Framework, to support the ongoing consultation process. This initial discussion document will be further developed in an iterative manner, drawing on the subsequent comments on it by Parties, observers and stakeholders, and various consultations, inputs and review processes.

2. The present document draws upon relevant decisions and recommendations adopted by the Conference of the Parties to the Convention and its Protocols as well as its subsidiary bodies, which are summarized in section II below, and the submissions made in response to recommendation 2/19 of the Subsidiary Body on Implementation, which are summarized in section III. A total of 95 submissions were received, of which 21 were from Parties. Some Parties and observers submitted more than once, and some submissions were on behalf of multiple Parties and/or stakeholders.1 It also presents, in section IV, a set of discussion questions which Parties and observers may wish to consider when providing further views on the scope and content of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework. The questions are not intended to be limiting or to prejudge the outcomes of the process for developing the post-2020 global biodiversity framework but, rather, to facilitate the submission of further views and perspectives as well as discussions.

II. RELEVANT DECISIONS

3. Decision 14/34 sets out the process for developing the post-2020 global biodiversity framework, including the role of the intersessional meetings of the Convention’s subsidiary bodies, including the Open-ended Intersessional Working group on the Post-2020 Global Biodiversity Framework (hereafter “Working Group on Post-2020”), which is co-chaired by Mr. Francis Ogwal (Uganda) and Mr. Basile van Havre (Canada), and informal consultations. Parties and a wide range of stakeholders are encouraged to actively engage in the process. The decision also establishes a set of principles (participatory, inclusive,

1 A more comprehensive synthesis of views is provided in a supplementary document (CBD/POST2020/1/INF/1).

   

Distr. GENERAL

  

PREPARATIONS FOR THE POST-2020



BIODIVERSITY FRAMEWORK

  

CBD/POST2020/PREP/1/1 Page 2

gender responsive, transformative, comprehensive, catalytic, visible, knowledge-based, transparent, efficient, results-oriented, iterative and flexible) to guide the process. Further, decision 14/34:

(a) Provides 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;

(b) Urges Parties and stakeholders, to actively engage and contribute to the process of developing a robust post-2020 global biodiversity framework, to facilitate dialogues on the post-2020 global biodiversity framework and to provide timely financial contributions and other support to the process for developing the post-2020 global biodiversity framework, including by offering to host global, regional, sectoral, or thematic consultations on this issue;

(c) Invites Parties and stakeholders when organizing meetings and consultations relevant to biodiversity and ecosystem functions and services, to consider dedicated sessions or space to facilitate discussions on the development of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework;

(d) Invites Parties and other Governments to consider developing, as appropriate to the national context, individually or jointly, and on a voluntary basis, biodiversity commitments which, among other things contribute to an effective post-2020 global biodiversity framework;

(e) Encourages indigenous peoples and local communities and all relevant organizations and stakeholders to consider developing, prior to the fifteenth meeting of the Conference of the Parties, biodiversity commitments that may contribute to the achievement of the three objectives of the Convention, strengthen national biodiversity strategies and action plans (NBSAPs), facilitate the achievement of the Aichi Biodiversity Targets and contribute to an effective post-2020 global biodiversity framework and to make such information available as a contribution to the Sharm El-Sheikh to Beijing Action Agenda for Nature and People;

(f) Sets out that the process will be gender-responsive by systematically integrating a gender perspective and ensuring appropriate representation, particularly of women and girls, in the process (in addition, the Conference of the Parties, in decision 14/18, specifically requested the Executive Secretary to include discussions on the linkages between gender and biodiversity, and the lessons learned from implementation of the 2015-2020 Gender Plan of Action within the regional consultations);

(g) Notes decision 14/20 on digital sequence information on genetic resources. 4. Complementary decisions were adopted by the Parties to the Cartagena and Nagoya Protocols to

the Convention:

(a) Decision CP-9/7 of the Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety stresses 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;

(b) Decision NP-3/15 of the Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Nagoya Protocol welcomes decision 14/34 of the Conference of the Parties and invites Parties to the Protocol to participate in the process for developing the post-2020 global biodiversity framework. It also encourages Parties to undertake measures to enhance the implementation of the Nagoya Protocol on Access and Benefit-Sharing, in the context of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework and requests that the Compliance Committee at its next meeting consider how to support and promote compliance with the Nagoya Protocol within the post-2020 global biodiversity framework.
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5. Further, decisions of the Conference of the Parties to the Convention contain provisions relevant to the development of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework. These include the following:

(a) Decision 14/34 requests 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;

(b) Decision 14/20 establishes a science- and policy-based process on digital sequence information on genetic resources with an extended Ad Hoc Technical Expert Group. The Working Group on Post-2020 is to consider the outcomes of the Ad Hoc Technical Expert Group and make recommendations on how to address digital sequence information on genetic resources in the context of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework;

(c) Decision 14/22 affirms that resource mobilization will be an integral part of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework and initiates 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. The process for considering this issue requests the Executive Secretary to contract a panel of experts to prepare reports on several issues related to the Strategy for Resource Mobilization to help inform the work of the Working Group on Post-2020 and the Conference of the Parties;

(d) Decision 14/23 welcomes the 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;

(e) Decision 14/24 requests the Executive Secretary to organize regional and stakeholder- specific consultative workshops and online discussion forums, in conjunction with the preparatory process for the post-2020 global biodiversity framework, to contribute to the preparation of the draft long- term strategic framework for capacity-building beyond 2020 and to submit a draft for consideration by the Subsidiary Body on Implementation at its third meeting;

(f) Decision 14/3 establishes an Informal Advisory Group on Mainstreaming of Biodiversity, to advise the Executive Secretary and the Bureau on further development of the proposal for a long-term approach to mainstreaming biodiversity including on ways to integrate mainstreaming adequately into the post-2020 global biodiversity framework, to be submitted to the Subsidiary Body on Implementation for consideration at its third meeting;

(g) Decision 14/30 of the Conference of the Parties to the Convention on Biological Diversity requested the organization of a workshop to facilitate discussions among Parties of the various biodiversity-related conventions to explore ways in which the conventions can contribute to the elaboration of the framework and identify specific elements that could be included in the framework;

(h) Decision 14/1 requests the Executive Secretary to use the regional assessments on biodiversity and ecosystem services and other outputs of the Intergovernmental Platform on Biodiversity and Ecosystem Services in the preparation of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework under the Convention;

6. In addition decision 14/2 of the Conference of the Parties welcomed the conclusions of the Subsidiary Body on Scientific, Technical and Technological Advice regarding scenarios for the 2050 Vision for Biodiversity and noted their relevance to the discussions on the long-term strategic directions to the 2050 Vision for Biodiversity, approaches to living in harmony with nature and the process of developing a post-2020 global biodiversity framework. Among these conclusions are the following:

      

CBD/POST2020/PREP/1/1 Page 4

(a) The 2050 Vision of the Strategic Plan remains relevant and should be considered in any follow-up to the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020. The 2050 Vision contains elements that could be translated into a long-term goal for biodiversity and provide context for discussions on possible biodiversity targets for 2030 as part of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework;

(b) The pathways towards a sustainable future, while plausible, require transformational change (...) Further work is required to identify ways and means by which the Convention and the post- 2020 global biodiversity framework can leverage such change.

7. Finally, other decisions highlight issues to be considered in the post-2020 framework: the linkages between biodiversity and climate change (decision 14/5); the conservation and sustainable use of wild and managed pollinators (decision 14/6); knowledge management under the Convention and its Protocols (decision 14/25); process for aligning national reporting under the Convention and its Protocols (decision 14/27); and evaluation of the effectiveness of policy measures (decision 14/28).

III. SUMMARY OF THE SYNTHESIS OF SUBMISSIONS

8. The submissions received on the scope and content of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework, synthesized in an information note (CBD/POST2020/1/INF/1), address a number of general themes. Below is a summary of the synthesis.

9. Many of the submissions received to date have focused on general issues or concepts. An exception to this general trend is the issue of biodiversity targets, as numerous suggestions on the possible wording for new targets have been made. On the basis of the submissions to date, the following general issues can be identified:

(a) The post-2020 global biodiversity framework needs to be commensurate with the challenges of fostering the transformational change required to address biodiversity loss and achieve the 2050 Vision;

(b) The post-2020 global biodiversity framework should serve as a universal framework for action on biodiversity;

(c) The post-2020 global biodiversity framework should serve to raise the profile of current biodiversity challenge, engage attention at a high political level and mobilize action from all stakeholders;

(d) The post-2020 global biodiversity framework should not be less ambitious than the current Strategic Plan for Biodiversity, the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development or any other biodiversity-related plan or framework adopted under a multilateral environmental agreement;

(e) The post-2020 global biodiversity framework should build on the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020. Many have suggested that this should be the starting point for discussions. However, there have also been suggestions to bring in new elements which would significantly expand the scope of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework in comparison with its predecessors. Conversely, some submissions have cautioned against expanding the scope of the framework;

(f) The post-2020 global biodiversity framework should link to and support, in a coherent and synergistic manner, other frameworks and processes which have a direct bearing on biodiversity, in particular the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development, the Paris Agreement on Climate Change, and other relevant processes adopted under the biodiversity-related conventions;

(g) The post-2020 global biodiversity framework needs to address the three objectives of the Convention in a balanced way and reflect issues related to access and benefit-sharing and biosafety;

(h) The different elements of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework should be linked through a conceptual framework. Some have suggested that this should be based on the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity while others have suggested alternative approaches, including a pyramid approach with
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layers of objectives, actions and targets in support of an “apex goal” and combinations of outcome and output targets;

(i) The 2050 Vision of the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020 of “Living in Harmony with Nature by 2050” remains relevant and should be a part of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework. Many have noted the need to better articulate what this Vision means in concrete terms and various possible interpretations have been presented;

(j) The post-2020 global biodiversity framework should contain targets which are specific, measurable, ambitious, realistic and time-bound. These targets should be knowledge-based, including on scientific and traditional knowledge, address both desired outcomes and processes, be easy to communicate and be designed to galvanize action across society. There is support for using the Aichi Biodiversity Target as a starting point for discussing future targets. Some expressed the view that changes to the Aichi Targets should be kept limited. Others suggested more comprehensive changes, and numerous suggestions for additional or revised targets have been proposed;

(k) It has been suggested that the number of biodiversity targets should be limited to 20. However, given the ideas expressed for new targets, it appears that some would like to increase the number of targets. Conversely, there has also been a suggestion to limit the number of targets. Some have suggested using a nested target approach or developing sub-targets. The 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development has been suggested as a useful model in this respect;

(l) Indicators, building on those identified for the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020, should be identified and developed in parallel to the development of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework;

(m) The post-2020 global biodiversity framework should foster strong ownership and support concrete actions and contributions for its immediate implementation by Parties, other Governments, subnational and local governments, and cities, as well as indigenous peoples and local communities, relevant international organizations, civil society organizations, women’s and youth organizations, the private and financial sectors and other stakeholders;

(n) The NBSAPs should continue to be the main instrument for implementing the convention and the post-2020 global biodiversity framework. However, these need to be strengthened;

(o) The post-2020 global biodiversity framework should have a focus on implementation and have an effective process for monitoring and an effective review process to improve transparency and accountability. However, the specifics for accomplishing this beyond the established national reporting and voluntary peer-review process need to be determined. The establishment of a “ratcheting-up” mechanism and a compliance process was suggested. Similarly, the need to regularly review progress in implementation, possibly every two or five years, was raised;

(p) There is general support for voluntary commitments from Parties and the private sector. However, the statements have been general and have not articulated what this would entail in practice;

(q) The importance of developing a holistic resource mobilization strategy to mobilize resources from all sources was noted. Some also suggested that this strategy should incorporate an innovative financial mechanism. However, some expressed reservation regarding the role of the private sector in the implementation of the Convention;

(r) The post-2020 global biodiversity framework should have a coherent and comprehensive communication and outreach action plan to promote awareness of, and effective engagement in its implementation. This plan should encourage whole of societal engagement and reach beyond the biodiversity community;
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(s) The post-2020 global biodiversity framework should effectively incorporate gender considerations and the perspectives of indigenous peoples and local communities;

(t) The post-2020 global biodiversity framework should have a focus on mainstreaming biodiversity within sectors and across society;

(u) Various gaps in the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020 have been identified. Some felt that these should be addressed in the post-2020 global biodiversity framework.

IV. ISSUES AND QUESTIONS FOR DISCUSSION

10. 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

11. 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 others have 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?

B. Ambition of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework

12. 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?

C. 2050 Vision for Biodiversity

13. 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?

D. Mission

14. 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?

E. Biodiversity Targets

15. 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:

* (a)  What does “SMART” targets mean in practical terms?
* (b)  How should the set of targets in the post-2020 global biodiversity framework relate

to existing Aichi Biodiversity Targets?

(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?

F. Voluntary commitments and contributions

16. 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?

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

17. 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?

H. Mainstreaming

18. 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
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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?

I. Relationship with the current Strategic Plan

19. 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?

K. Indicators

20. 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?

L. Implementation and NBSAPs

21. 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?

M. Resource mobilization

22. 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?

N. Financial mechanisms

23. Decision 14/23 welcomes the 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?

O. Review process

24. 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?

P. Relationship between the Convention and the Protocols

25. 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?

26. 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?

Q. Integrating diverse perspectives

27. 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:

(a) 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?

(b) 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?

(c) 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?
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(d) 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?

(e) 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?

(f) 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?

28. 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?

R. Communication and outreach

29. 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?

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_