

UN Environment response to the post-2020 global biodiversity framework discussion paper

As part of the process of developing the post-2020 global biodiversity framework established in [CBD COP decision 14/34](#), an initial [discussion paper](#) was made available summarizing and analysing the [initial views of Parties and observers](#). This discussion paper provided a basis for regional consultations, and feedback on the document was requested by 15 April 2019 ([CBD Notification 2019-08](#)). The discussion paper includes various questions intended to stimulate further discussion on key issues and to guide the initial development of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework. The following views have been compiled from colleagues within UN Environment, including UNEP-WCMC, to respond to the questions raised in the initial discussion paper. These also build on a [previous submission by UN Environment](#).

1. Structure of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework

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?

The structure and language of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework should be designed with three related aims in mind:

- a) To clearly set out what needs to be done in order to get on the pathway for achieving the 2050 vision of 'living in harmony with nature'
- b) To provide a mechanism that relates this to delivering the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development and its Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs)
- c) To facilitate and support the necessary action by all key players for delivering the post-2020 global biodiversity framework

There are various ways in which this can be done, both in terms of structure and language, but in doing so it will be important to build on the *Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020* and make the relationship to the current Aichi Biodiversity Targets clear, given the efforts at national and international levels that have already been made to align with these targets (including by other MEAs). The links to the 2030 Agenda and SDGs are also vital because of ways in which these have already become embedded into national and international policies and actions, and the recognition already being given to the importance of biodiversity and ecosystem services in delivering the SDGs. Finally it is important to demonstrate how this draws on the evidence base available, and in particular the assessments produced by IPBES and others.

Formal and informal discussion on the post-2020 global biodiversity framework has already led to consideration of various concerns and possible options for addressing them, as is apparent from the synthesis of initial views of Parties and observers. Some of the issues under discussion relate directly to the mandate of the CBD, others do not. Some are aspirational about what we want to achieve, others are more about promoting specific types of action based on what might be needed. In order to more clearly respond to concerns about mandates, and what the Convention might and might not consider directly, targets and associated actions might be considered in several different categories, which may require different approaches to language and target setting. These might fall into four categories, as follows:

- a) Aspirational targets on what that Convention and its Protocols are trying to achieve with respect to biodiversity and ecosystem services, relating to directly to milestones on the way to achieving the 2050 vision for biodiversity.
- b) Targets and milestones focused on actions that the biodiversity community itself is able to undertake as it already has the mandate to do so (for example with respect to protected areas and other effective area-based conservation measures, wildlife management, ecosystem restoration, access and benefit-sharing, addressing invasive alien species, and so on).
- c) Targets, milestones and actions that relate to influence on other sectors, and interactions with other agendas, addressing drivers of change that might be considered to be beyond the direct mandate of

the Convention and its Protocols, and where additional approaches and partnerships will be needed to encourage change, and to foster synergies and coherence with related agendas and processes.

- d) Enabling activities relating to resource mobilization, capacity building, technology transfer, information for decision making, and so on, which are essential for underpinning action to achieve other targets and milestones.

For simplified communications it might also be useful to somehow categorize targets, milestones and actions in a cross-cutting manner into: (a) those that are addressing the causes of biodiversity loss; (b) those that will make up for existing degradation of biodiversity (through restoration action); (c) those that will ensure the conservation and sustainable use of remaining biodiversity (for example through expansion of area-based conservation and efforts on management of species, populations and genetic resources); and (d) those that contribute to the sharing of benefits derived from the use of biodiversity and ecosystem services.

2. Ambition of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework

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

The 2050 Vision of a world of “living in harmony with nature” as further elaborated in [CBD COP decision X/2](#) is already ambitious, and to achieve it will require a transformation of the relationship of modern society with the natural environment (as was discussed at SBSTTA-21). In addition, the SDGs adopted in 2016 and the UNFCCC Paris Agreement adopted in 2015 should also inspire ambition and provide further framework for defining it. Meanwhile although many of the Aichi Biodiversity Targets are very ambitious in nature, these have largely not been achieved, underlining the fact that additional ways need to be found to encourage greater ambition in implementation. Greater emphasis is therefore needed on achieving “transformational change”.

There are two approaches to addressing ambition through the post-2020 global biodiversity framework:

- a) Adopting wording that is sufficiently aspirational to encourage further action. This might be through the wording of targets or milestones, the adoption of principles or commitments, or the use of effective communications associated with the framework. For example, the preamble to the UN General Assembly Resolution 70/1 ‘Transforming our world: The 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development’ makes the following commitments, the second of which is particularly pertinent:

People: We are determined to end poverty and hunger, in all their forms and dimensions, and to ensure that all human beings can fulfil their potential in dignity and equality and in a healthy environment.

Planet: We are determined to protect the planet from degradation, including through sustainable consumption and production, sustainably managing its natural resources and taking urgent action on climate change, so that it can support the needs of the present and future generations.

Prosperity: We are determined to ensure that all human beings can enjoy prosperous and fulfilling lives and that economic, social and technological progress occurs in harmony with nature.

Since governments have already committed that, “*all human beings can enjoy prosperous and fulfilling lives and that economic, social and technological progress occurs in harmony with nature*”, the ambition of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework should commit to achieving this aim.

- b) Promoting and facilitating specific actions that can deliver transformation. This would include, for example, a full and effective implementation of mainstreaming as a key mechanism for delivering change in attitudes and approaches to the values of biodiversity and ecosystem services, more effective natural capital accounting, and so on. In this context, one aspect of mainstreaming that might be given more focus is encouraging and promoting further application of consideration of ‘nature-based solutions’ for addressing other key environmental concerns, such as climate change, disaster risk reduction, and access to water. Doing this will further reinforce the link between biodiversity and the other SDGs, and increase understanding of the multiple values of biodiversity.

Ambition can also be built on:

- c) New opportunities arising. For example, the recent adoption by the UN General Assembly of a decision to recognise a UN Decade on Ecosystem Restoration 2021-2030, recognizing the huge potential for restoration to meet biodiversity and wider sustainable development needs. Ambition on ecosystem restoration beyond existing commitments (of 350 million hectares restored by 2030) could mitigate ongoing biodiversity loss in the short term whilst underlying drivers of biodiversity loss and unsustainable use are addressed.
- d) New evidence. For example, the IPBES assessments completed last year, and the IPBES global assessment due for completion in May 2019 provide both further confirmation of why action is needed that should be used to encourage ambition, and review policy options that can help drive change.

And there are two other issues that will need to be addressed in order to achieve increased ambition:

- e) Specify the constituency of change agents (such as governments, local governments and cities, parliamentarians, United Nations bodies, businesses, the finance community, international organizations, non-governmental organizations and civil society, educational institutions, citizens, environmental rights defenders) that need to be involved in delivering the 2050 Vision for Biodiversity, and develop specific actions that would be expected of each of these groups to ‘bend the curve’ of biodiversity loss over the next 10 years, and better enable them to take such actions. For example, what is it that we expect the private sector, or cities, to do, and how do we provide sufficient encouragement.
- f) Better understand how to effectively address the drivers of biodiversity loss that fall with constituents and in sectors beyond the perceived mandate of the Convention and its Protocols, but which are impacting on biodiversity and ecosystem services. This will include effectively addressing issues such as the following: promotion and integration of nature-based solutions in addressing climate change and land degradation; promotion and integration of sustainable consumption and production (for example through sustainable public procurement); promotion and integration of sustainable agricultural practices, and biodiversity-positive commodity supply chains; promotion and integration of circular economy with reduced resource requirements, and waste; promotion and integration of a sustainable bio-economy for example through expanding the uptake of natural capital accounting; promotion of sound chemicals management; promotion and integration of a rapid transition to renewable energy; etc. It will also include encouraging and facilitating increased engagement with other sectors when developing, revising and implementing NBSAPs.

Finally, ambition has to be related to need. It is important to develop an understanding of what ‘dangerous’ amounts of biodiversity loss might mean for the planet, and to encourage a level of ambition based on this understanding. However, this requires better understanding of questions such as “does the current loss matter?”, and “what bad things might happen if we don’t stem loss”.

3. 2050 Vision for Biodiversity

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?

“Living in harmony with nature” implies a situation where people are living in and using the natural environment in ways that maintain its status and functioning, and in ways that ensure the integrity of the planet is not compromised for future generations to enjoy. The term “nature” is attractive but vague, and so needs to be translated into something measurable for use in decision-making for sustainable development. At the same time the concept of biodiversity defies easy definition, as it has different meanings for different sectors, has multiple facets and scales to consider and is inherently multidimensional.

In [CBD COP decision X/2](#), “living in harmony with nature” is qualified by the following text “by 2050, biodiversity is valued, conserved, restored and wisely used, maintaining ecosystem services, sustaining a healthy planet, and delivering benefits essential for all people”. While the wording is rather generic, it can be used as a basis for deriving clearer direction. For example the following:

- The multiple values of biodiversity are understood, well communicated, and taken fully into account by all stakeholders, thereby reducing or eliminating drivers of change
- People have a clear understanding of the strong links between biodiversity and their everyday lives, including through its relevance to food, water and health
- Action is taken to ensure the conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity and ecosystem services, so that there is no further net loss to biodiversity, ecosystem function or ecosystem services
- The conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity is complemented by action to restore biodiversity and ecosystem services, including where necessary restoring ecosystem function
- Where necessary and appropriate, action is taken to use biodiversity and nature-based solutions to address societal needs and concerns

That being said, there is still a need to develop a clearer understanding of the 2050 Vision for Biodiversity, and of exactly what this implies for developing a post-2020 global biodiversity framework that will set the world on a pathway to realise the vision. This will require the following.

- a) Unpacking the 2050 vision as a basis for informing other actions.
- b) Identifying through further analysis of scenarios, projections and understanding of the lag times in socio-ecological systems of what needs to be achieved *and can be achieved* by 2030, and what needs to be achieved and can be achieved by 2040, as two milestones towards 2050. Based on this, develop a post-2020 global biodiversity framework addressing both what needs to be achieved by 2030, and what needs to be in place to promote and facilitate appropriate actions in future decades.
- c) Further identifying specific actions necessary for addressing drivers of biodiversity loss and “bending the curve” of biodiversity loss by 2030 drawing from scenarios and modelling approaches. This may also include undertaking a meta-analysis of these different studies to determine confidence and uncertainty in relation to the key actions required in order to progress on pathways towards the 2050 Vision, and identifying policy, regulatory and practical approaches necessary for facilitating and promoting these actions.
- d) Developing technical documents and communication materials to increase understanding of the 2050 vision and what is needed to achieve it as part of the communications surrounding development and adoption of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework.
- e) As the post-2020 global biodiversity framework is developed, comparing emerging ambitions to assumptions in the scenarios of plausible pathways to the 2050 vision in order to understand the extent to which ambition in the framework, and any associated national commitments match the necessary progress in the next decade for achieving the 2050 Vision for Biodiversity.

To achieve “living in harmony with nature” will entail that this becomes a core value and goal of individuals, organisations, business and governments at all levels. This will require sufficient understanding and knowledge of ecosystem functioning, status, and of human impacts on ecosystems and the supply of ecosystem services. It will also require the people and institutions that physically work with and affect the natural environment to have the skills, methods and tools to intentionally work with ecosystem functioning. How to achieve this will need to be considered as the post-2020 global biodiversity framework is developed.

Such knowledge and actions needs to recognise the multiple scales of ecosystem functioning, from global climate and mineral cycling and species’ migrations, to water catchments and local ecosystem properties. A common challenge in environmental management is that access and tenure rights of land and water resources, including the oceans, are often not designed for management to work with ecosystem functioning at multiple scales. “Living in harmony with nature” will require new and strengthened institutional mechanisms with this understanding, and how to achieve this will again need to be considered as the post-2020 global biodiversity framework is developed.

4. Mission

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

The mission should set the stage for what will be achieved by 2030, on the road to delivery of the 2050 vision. In doing so it should:

- a) Be relevant to all aspects of the Convention and its Protocols, including all three objectives of the Convention, and all components of biodiversity and ecosystem services, but also going beyond this to be relevant to delivery of all the biodiversity-related conventions.
- b) Be realistic and achievable and confirm direction of travel, recognising that aspiration is already provided for in the 2050 vision.
- c) Encourage and inspire action, placing into context any targets, milestone and actions included in the post-2020 global biodiversity framework.
- d) Clearly relate delivery of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework to delivery of the SDGs and their targets, most of which are also to be delivered by 2030. A mission statement couched in these terms would position the post-2020 global biodiversity framework as a mechanism in support of the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development, and encourage a focus on achievement of the already adopted targets.

It is assumed that the mission will focus on **actions** rather than biodiversity outcomes, setting out what needs to be in place by 2030 as a milestone *en route* to 2050. The actions will be encouraged through targets and milestones set out in the post-2020 global biodiversity framework, and chosen from amongst those most likely to deliver maximum benefit in terms of reducing and even reversing biodiversity loss, and securing benefits.

5. Biodiversity Targets

Question: What does “SMART” targets mean in practical terms?

Global targets will need to be interpreted and adapted at the national level. The use of SMART criteria in setting global targets should therefore be considered with this point in mind.

A recent ‘SMART’-based expert assessment of the Aichi targets (sent out to CBD and SBSTTA National Focal Points, academics, non-governmental organisations, government agencies and other relevant parties)^{1,2} used the following definitions:

- Specific - clear and well-defined objectives (e.g. quantified percentages, precisely defined terms etc.)
- Measurable - progress can be assessed using data already available or feasible to mobilise by 2020 (e.g. quantitative indicators exist or are realistic to produce by 2020)
- Ambitious - aims sufficiently high to achieve the overall mission
- Realistic - can feasibly be achieved considering the time-frame, practicalities, plausible funding, etc.

Those carrying out the survey did not assess whether the targets were time-bound, as all targets were time-bound to 2015 or 2020, but they did assess the targets against two additional criteria that could also be considered in the post-2020 global biodiversity framework:

- Unambiguous - easy to understand and interpret with a single, clear definition
- Scalable - applicable at global, regional and national scales

Based on analysis using data from the fourth edition of the Global Biodiversity Outlook and the upcoming IPBES global assessment, their basic conclusion was that there was a positive relationship between progress and almost all of the elements of SMART-ness.

While it is essential that targets be measurable (so as to be able to track progress), they do not have to be quantitative. For example, “prevent and significantly reduce marine pollution of all kinds” is potentially

¹ Green, EJ, Buchanan, GM, Butchart, SHM, Chandler, GM, Burgess, ND, Hill, SLL, Gregory, RD 2019. Relating characteristics of global biodiversity targets to reported progress. *Conservation Biology*. <https://doi.org/10.1111/cobi.13322>

² CBD/SBSTTA/22/INF/32

measurable but does not have quantitative outcomes. For most of the likely subjects in the post-2020 global biodiversity framework it is not conceptually or scientifically appropriate to define global-scale quantitative outcomes that would be meaningfully translated to the diversity of national circumstances.

It has also been suggested that the targets need to be “actionable”, in the sense that they are linked to clear and do-able actions. This could be considered as part of being “realistic”, but it is an important point to bear in mind. In this regard the wording of targets should encourage action, such as in the form of the SDG targets which are all phrased in the form of commitments or commands, and so include a verb such as ‘ensure’, ‘maintain’, ‘prevent’, ‘implement’, ‘achieve’, ‘strengthen’, etc.

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

Any targets in the post-2020 global biodiversity framework should include the subject areas of the existing Aichi Biodiversity Targets, and build on and complement them so that there is national-level continuity in NBSAPs and reporting. However:

- This does not preclude reorganization of the targets, which might be more meaningfully presented in other ways.
- The wording of the current Aichi Biodiversity Targets could be revised to improve their clarity and interpretation for national use, and to make them more action oriented.
- Some of the Aichi Biodiversity Targets are very generic or insufficiently detailed, and to properly address their subject there may need to be more than one target, rewording, or breaking down into elements.
- Some of the Aichi Biodiversity Targets may need to be revised to encompass other aspects of the issue being addressed (for example Target 8 on pollution only addresses some sources of pollution).
- There may be opportunities to revise current Aichi Biodiversity Targets to make them more policy-relevant and synergistically linked to similar targets in other multilateral environmental agreements and processes.
- There are gaps in the current Aichi Biodiversity Targets that need to be addressed, so new targets may be needed, even if building on the current ones.

There have been a number of analyses of the Aichi Biodiversity Targets, and their effectiveness, completeness, relationship to other agendas, and so on. It might well be useful to carry out a meta-analysis of the current set of targets in order to identify strengths and weaknesses, and to identify both gaps and potential relationships with other strategies and targets. This would draw together and build on the reviews and analyses that have already been carried out.

Question: How should the set of targets in the post-2020 global biodiversity framework align with other global targets, including those adopted under the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development?

The 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development and the SDGs are the dominant framework at global and national levels for development actions and funding, and it is the overall framework for the UN system. Acknowledging the importance of the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020 and its Aichi Biodiversity Targets, governments decided to put biodiversity as one of the core elements to deliver the 2030 Agenda, not only through SDGs 14 (life below water) and 15 (life on land), but also through a series of SDG targets developed from the Aichi Biodiversity Targets. The post-2020 global biodiversity framework can obtain multi-sectoral support for its implementation if it is designed to enable achievement of the SDG biodiversity-related targets, and so ultimately supporting realisation of the 2030 Agenda.

As recognised in [CBD COP decision 14/34](#), the adoption of a post-2020 global biodiversity framework will create the need to consider those SDG targets that have endpoints in 2020. This provides an opportunity for making the relevant targets under the 2030 Agenda fully aligned with the post-2020 global biodiversity framework. The 2030 Agenda has the needed political support at the highest levels. However, along with the possible updating of expired targets in the SDG framework, the development of the post-2020 biodiversity framework provides the opportunity to fill gaps in important biodiversity-related targets not currently contained in the SDGs. Given these points, the post-2020 global biodiversity framework should be communicated to the United Nations General Assembly and fed into the High-Level Political Forum process in draft form as early as possible to ensure continued alignment with the 2030 Agenda.

Consideration should also be given to the development of targets that explicitly aim to align the post-2020 global biodiversity framework with other global targets and actions, such as those under the UNFCCC and its Paris Agreement, and UNCCD. These could, for example, relate to promoting nature-based solutions for addressing key concerns under these two agreements.

6. Voluntary commitments and contributions

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?

Although “voluntary commitments” is being used as shorthand, the wording in [CBD COP decision 14/34](#) refers to “*biodiversity commitments*” being developed on a voluntary basis, rather than “voluntary commitments”. Such commitments will be most effective if they are part of the core and strategic process rather than *ad hoc*, and if they are additional rather than restating existing commitments and action. In this regard criteria like the following might be considered for encouraging contributions for governments:

- adds political commitment and resources
- significantly extends what has already been planned
- builds on what has already been agreed through the NBSAP process
- encourages increased commitment by other governments
- encourages increased commitment by other actors
- contributes to achievement of specific global targets
- contributes to achievement of specific national targets and NBSAPs

For CBD Parties it is important to clarify the relationship between additional commitments and NBSAPs, so that the national planning process required by the Convention is not undermined in any way by a new process for making additional commitments, but is reinforced by it. Future commitments should be additional to and build on those contained within existing NBSAPs and other current national environmental policy goals which have been developed since NBSAP completion.

Additional commitments could also be in the form of packaged nexus commitments, which thereby help promote links between sectors. These might address issues such as:

- biodiversity objectives achieved through conservation agriculture or sustainable practices
- biodiversity objectives achieved through sustainable consumption and production actions
- biodiversity objectives achieved through effective implementation and enforcement of legislation
- biodiversity objectives achieved as a result of sound trade measures
- biodiversity safeguarded through indigenous knowledge and practices

A consistent framework for categorising commitments and contributions (including those within NBSAPs) will be needed to be able to aggregate national pledges in a meaningful way. This framework could be measured in basic conservation outcomes such as area of degraded land to be restored, which can be aggregated regionally and globally using common units of measurement and definitions. Without some structure to the framework, it will be difficult to track collective impact and whether pledged efforts are sufficient to meet future targets/goals.

It may also be valuable to more clearly define the forms of contributions that would be most helpful from non-state actors. These might take the form, for example, of financial support, in-kind contributions, capacity-building, awareness raising, development and implementation of ‘biodiversity friendly’ policies and actions by related sectors (such as in the commercial and production sectors and the media) and other areas.

Finally, ensuring a process for periodic review and “ratcheting up” of commitments under the Convention will likely be essential in order for implementation and action to be sufficient to meet ambitious future global targets.

In all of the above there is opportunity to learn lessons from what has happened under the UNFCCC Paris Agreement with respect to Nationally Determined Contributions, and there may also be opportunities to relate to or align with this process, where it is appropriate to do so.

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

Question: How could a post-2020 global biodiversity framework help to ensure coherence, integration and a holistic approach to biodiversity governance and what are the implications for the scope and content of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework?

The more effective management of biodiversity and ecosystem services, including through restoration, is directly relevant to achieving the objectives of both of the other Rio Conventions (including the Paris Agreement and Land Degradation Neutrality), the Sendai Framework on Disaster Risk Reduction, and to achieving a number of the SDGs including for example SDG6 on water. This needs to be recognised in the post-2020 global biodiversity framework such that actions promoted are relevant to achieving multiple outcomes, and are understood as such.

There is a wide range of biodiversity-related agreements, including not only those multilateral environment agreements represented within the Biodiversity Liaison Group, but also regional agreements such as the regional seas conventions. All have biodiversity objectives of some form and recognize the importance of collaboration and promoting synergy through their governing bodies' decisions and resolutions. There is opportunity for the post-2020 global biodiversity framework to provide a strategic framework relevant to all of these agreements. Achieving this will require steps to be taken to ensure that views and inputs from various biodiversity-related agreements are gathered and reflected in the post-2020 framework.

As previously mentioned, the post-2020 global biodiversity framework should be designed as a mechanism for supporting the achievement of all the biodiversity-related targets of the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development, and especially SDGs 14 and 15 as integral foundations for all the SDGs. The SDGs and their targets are a comprehensive blueprint for sustainable development. There are however, a few specific biodiversity-related subjects which are not adequately covered by the SDG targets, and this will also need explicit consideration during the post-2020 process. Policy coherence is guided by SDG 17, through strengthening partnerships and coordination mechanisms for sustainable development. It may well be helpful for the post-2020 global biodiversity framework to be integrated and coordinated through these same policy mechanisms.

Strengthening the relationship between IPBES and the post-2020 global biodiversity framework is a key element in enhancing biodiversity governance through ensuring that the supporting scientific evidence needs of the global community are met through timely and demand-driven assessments which then help to shape and develop future policy and implementation actions proposed by the framework.

Engagement with other relevant processes can also be strengthened through more explicitly identifying responsibilities and accountability. It can also be done through formulating targets or promoting enabling activities that actively promote synergistic policy and knowledge tools for collaboration across biodiversity-related Conventions and beyond. The post-2020 global biodiversity framework is an opportunity to validate and realize synergies for biodiversity governance through the coherent implementation of biodiversity-related conventions, and its development will hopefully provide opportunity to reflect on how cooperation, knowledge sharing, and joint action (such as on capacity-building) can lead to more coherent policy making, efficiency, optimisation of resources and avoiding duplication of efforts.

The sort of initiatives that could be further promoted include InforMEA,³ online reporting systems used by multiple conventions and agreements,⁴ and the Data Reporting Tool (DART) which is currently being developed and tested with Parties to multiple conventions and agreements, as well as resources such as *Sourcebook of opportunities for enhancing cooperation among the Biodiversity-related Conventions at national and regional levels*,⁵ and the "Compendia" supporting knowledge sharing among the biodiversity-related conventions⁶ to enhance potential synergies (all developed by UNEP-WCMC). All of these initiatives have been undertaken in response to requests made by Parties to Conventions, including most recently through [CBD COP decision XIII/24](#).

³ www.inforMEA.org

⁴ See for example <http://cms-family-ors.unep-wcmc.org/>

⁵ <https://www.unep-wcmc.org/resources-and-data/sourcebook-of-opportunities-for-enhancing-cooperation-among-the-biodiversity-related-conventions-at-national-and-regional-levels>

⁶ <https://www.unep-wcmc.org/resources-and-data/biodiversitysynergies>

In considering the above, it is also important to recall that biodiversity Governance as a concept is not directly addressed by any of the Aichi Biodiversity Targets. It includes not only coherence across MEAs and other relevant processes, but also elements of law, policy, institutions, stakeholder engagement, and coordination mechanisms. These were highlighted as cross-cutting principles but were not explicitly monitored in the Aichi target framework. Development of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework provides a key opportunity to consider how to address this gap, including potentially through a dedicated target or set of targets with related indicators and monitoring mechanisms.

8. Mainstreaming

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

Massive scaling-up of mainstreaming will be fundamental to achieving transformational changes and positive biodiversity outcomes. However, it requires meaningfully engaging with other sectors and taking on board multiple aspirations and objectives. The post-2020 global biodiversity framework should have a strong focus on further opportunities for mainstreaming, including, for example, further promoting natural capital accounting.

If the post-2020 global biodiversity framework has a nature-focussed approach to biodiversity, as some submissions have suggested, mainstreaming will be considerably more difficult. The post-2020 global biodiversity framework should instead be framed as a plan to consolidate and enhance the biological natural capital on which society and human wellbeing depends. Opportunities should be taken to explicitly reflect these dependencies and engage relevant economic sectors, groups and interests in the actual drafting. The post-2020 global biodiversity framework should be designed through a process that will lead to it being adopted by UN entities linked to those sectors thereby mainstreaming it within the UN system and the Environment Management Group. The collaboration with UN agencies may be further strengthened at the national level through integrating biodiversity policies in UNDAFs (United Nations Development Assistance Frameworks).

The post-2020 framework should enable and promote further efforts through which transformative change can be realized (e.g. sustainable agriculture, circular economy, sustainable consumption and production, etc.). It should also promote better integration of natural capital/biodiversity considerations into green economy-related legislations, policies and strategies (building on the successes of climate change and renewable energy).

9. Relationship with the current Strategic Plan

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

Many Parties found difficulties in interpreting and operationalising the Aichi Biodiversity Targets when updating their NBSAPs, as the Aichi Biodiversity Targets were primarily defined and communicated as global targets and their coherence with national policy subjects and processes was not considered sufficiently. The setting of global targets should primarily consider how the targets would be interpreted and adapted at the national level, as this is the main scale of implementation.

Aichi Biodiversity Target 17 and support for NBSAP revision led to the updating of most countries NBSAPs, and there was a strong attention to costing of actions and resource mobilisation. However, there remains a general lack of national and international attention on implementation of NBSAPs and resources for this. This situation has been exacerbated by the attention now being given on developing the post-2020 global biodiversity framework. Much more attention needs to be paid to building national institutions and coordination mechanisms to support implementation of the Convention and its Protocols, including the provision of information on biodiversity and ecosystem services for effective decision-making.

As mentioned in the synthesis paper (chapter VII) there are a number of gaps in the *Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020*, and there are opportunities to rectify this in the post-2020 global biodiversity framework. Some of these are specific topics or cross-cutting issues and could be considered when it comes to the definition of specific targets and indicators in alignment with the SDG framework and other processes. Issues that are insufficiently addressed include, for example, specific ecosystems (such as mountain ecosystems), biosafety, and migratory species.

The *Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020* did not sufficiently address the topics subsequently covered by the SDGs, and issues of pollution, development, overpopulation, overexploitation, migration, and marine biodiversity. Also its implementation in some developing countries was undermined due to the lack of a comprehensive funding mechanisms and political instability.

Question: 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?

Delays will be avoided if:

- the relationships between the post-2020 global biodiversity framework and the *Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020* are clear and as similar as possible, so that Parties and others can build on and extend what they are already doing rather than start again with various planning processes
- the post-2020 global biodiversity framework is designed as an implementation mechanism for the SDGs, which Governments are already focused on delivering
- proposed actions within the post-2020 global biodiversity framework reinforce or build on commitments Governments have already made under UNFCCC and/or UNCCD
- the capacity-building and resource mobilization needs are more fully understood, and actions towards addressing them are fully aligned with the post-2020 global biodiversity framework
- there is a clear mechanism for review of commitments made by Governments and other (through whatever mechanism), and for encouraging the ratcheting up of commitments

Early identification of partner organizations for specific targets might also help to build the support for implementation, through broader engagement within the UN system and with other international organizations, and where appropriate the private sector.

10. Indicators

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?

The annex to [CBD COP decision XIII/28](#) already identifies a set of indicators that address many of the issues that are likely to be covered in the post-2020 global biodiversity framework. Although not apparent from the decision, this list was developed with the support of UNEP-WCMC, who provide the secretariat for the Biodiversity Indicators Partnership. While additional indicators may well be needed, this will depend on the targets that are proposed.

As has already been indicated, in order to be able to track implementation of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework from the outset, it will be important to ensure that baselines and indicators are in place as part of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework to be adopted, as well as in earlier drafts. In order to achieve this the post-2020 process should:

- a) Consider indicators and associated baselines as part of the development of targets and milestones, not retrospectively, and develop the indicator framework for adoption at the same time as the post-2020 global biodiversity framework.
- b) Develop associated guidance for Parties on the use of indicators in assessing progress in implementing the post-2020 global biodiversity framework, both building on the above-mentioned framework and drawing on review of the use of indicators at the national level as reported on in the 6th National Reports.
- c) Develop associated guidance for the private sector to translate and build on the indicators in such a way that they can support review of corporate action with respect to biodiversity and ecosystem services.

There are also lessons to be learnt from use of indicators to track progress in implementing the *Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020* that should be taken into account when planning for post-2020. On behalf of the Biodiversity Indicators Partnership UNEP-WCMC prepared an information document on this for COP 14. This

information document ([CBD/COP/14/INF/40](#)) forms part of this submission, and the recommendations are annexed to this submission.

Indicators are needed to monitor progress in achieving any targets and milestones set out in the post-2020 global biodiversity framework, and this is the focus of the comments above. However there are two further important points to consider:

- d) Consider alignment with use of biodiversity indicators by others, as these indicators need to be aligned with and consistent with indicators used in other related processes, including tracking progress in delivering the SDGs, and in assessment processes such as IPBES.
- e) Consider communication as well as monitoring, as use of indicators can also be an important part of communication strategy, but indicators used for communication need not necessarily be exactly the same set of indicators, and a smaller set of indicators or even more complex indices may be desirable.

11. Implementation and NBSAPs

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?

NBSAPs as a means of implementation of the CBD are well established, but it is a common challenge that they are not well linked or integrated with other biodiversity-related conventions or sectoral plans and strategies. It is suggested that their scope might be expanded to become national versions of a post-2020 global biodiversity framework, with perhaps a role as national frameworks for “living in harmony with nature”, to bring together commitments for achieving the biodiversity-related targets of the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development, the Paris Agreement adopted under the UNFCCC, the Sendai Framework for Disaster Risk Reduction, and the Land Degradation Neutrality goal. Depending on national circumstances, there may also be a need to strengthen associated legal frameworks and enforcement measures. It may also be of value to promote more effective use of planning tools and approaches, such as ‘proactive spatial planning’.

However, many NBSAPs are recently completed and have many years still to run. Action should not be put on hold while plans are revised to take account of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework, and recommendations might need to be made on how and when to consider NBSAPs in the light of the new framework and any new targets or milestones, and any possible new approaches (such as national commitments). This could usefully be discussed further with those organizations that have been supporting the development of NBSAPs, including UN Environment and UNDP, as well as being considered by Parties.

Despite the expectation that NBSAPs would be adopted as policy documents and integrated into national development plans and accounting system, this has not always been the case to date. In the next decade it would be valuable to monitor this aspect of implementation more closely.

12. Resource mobilization

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?

Part of this question is already addressed in [CBD COP decision 14/22](#) on resource mobilization (Section E), where the proposed activities for the panel of experts all need to be carried out in order to inform the work of the open-ended working group. This relates not only exploring options and approaches for mobilizing and providing additional resources from all sources, but also relates to the mainstreaming agenda, and by implication to increased understanding of and communication of the multiple values of biodiversity.

With respect to the post-2020 global biodiversity framework the following may need to be considered:

- Possible targets or milestones (or other approaches) for addressing Article 20 of the Convention, concerning provision of financial support and incentives
- Improvements in natural capital accounting so that the values of biodiversity and ecosystem services are better accounted for in national economies
- Better understanding of the links between mainstreaming and the resource mobilization agenda

When considering the future implementation of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework, Parties may need more help in mobilizing the necessary resources, given that the availability of resources is frequently cited as a key issue behind lack of progress in achieving the Aichi Biodiversity Targets. Thought might also be given to reviewing tools available to support resource mobilization, and further informing Parties as part of the means for enabling implementation.

13. Financial mechanisms

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?

This will be assisted by gaining an early understanding of the resources needed for effective implementation of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework at all appropriate levels, and in particular within GEF-eligible countries. The seventh GEF replenishment cycle runs from 2019-2023, so COP16 (currently expected to take place in 2022) will need this information in order to advise the GEF during preparation for the eighth replenishment cycle.

Meanwhile GEF-7 biodiversity focal area investments are likely to continue to be of direct importance for implementing the post-2020 global biodiversity framework, as these cover: mainstreaming biodiversity across sectors; addressing direct drivers to protect habitats and species; and further developing biodiversity policy and institutional frameworks. Further elaboration of these objectives in the GEF-7 biodiversity strategy identifies many of the approaches already discussed within the CBD.

It may also be of value to work with the GEF Secretariat to include specific guidance addressing any gaps identified in GEF-7 (which will also inform the GEF 8 replenishment). Examples of gaps in GEF-7 might include the absence of support to strengthen legal frameworks that underpin NBSAPs implementation, as well as support to programmes that stimulate cooperation mechanisms and development of tools relating to coherent implementation of multiple conventions.

14. Review process

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?

An effective review and reporting process needs to be in place when the post-2020 global biodiversity framework is adopted. This does not necessarily need to be part of the targets or milestones *per se*, but an enabling activity necessary to support implementation. In order to achieve this consideration might be given to the following:

- a) Upscale the voluntary peer-review process, as the centrepiece of the multidimensional review approach recognized by [CBD COP decision 14/29](#) and presented in documents [CBD/SI/2/11](#) and [UNEP/CBD/SBI/1/10/Add.3](#).
- b) Update the national reporting format to increase consistency and continuity across the different reporting cycles up to 2030, including stronger links to headline indicators that are developed (likely to include those adopted by [CBD COP decision XIII/28](#)), and aiming for increased complementarity with reports provided by countries to other biodiversity-related multilateral environmental agreements (striving towards a modular reporting approach) as indicated by [CBD COP decision XIII/27](#) and [CBD COP decision 14/27](#).
- c) Promote use of online reporting tools and reporting and knowledge management tools such as the Data and Reporting Tool, consistent with [CBD COP decision 14/27](#) on the process for aligning national reporting, assessment and review.
- d) Encourage the uptake of mechanisms for reporting progress within the private sector, both within the process outlined in the three points above, and through encouraging individual corporate reporting on biodiversity.

15. Relationship between the Convention and the Protocols

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

When developing any wording relating to biosafety in the post-2020 global biodiversity framework it will be important to recognise that not all Parties to the Convention are Parties to the Protocol. In order to avoid any potential conflicts it would be appropriate to draw on the wording of the Convention (in particular Article 19) rather than the wording of the Protocol, then recognising that the Protocol is one possible means of addressing the concern. It will also be useful to encourage further ratification, including ratification of the Nagoya – Kuala Lumpur Supplementary Protocol on Liability and Redress.

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?

When developing any wording relating to access and benefit sharing in the post-2020 global biodiversity framework it will be important to recognise that not all Parties to the Convention are Parties to the Protocol. In order to avoid any potential conflicts it would be appropriate to draw on the wording of the Convention (in particular Article 15) rather than the wording of the Protocol, then recognising that the Protocol is one possible means of addressing the concern. The post-2020 global biodiversity framework should encourage strengthened implementation and enhanced action from those that have access and benefit sharing measures in place so to advance the implementation of the third objective of the Convention. It will also be useful to encourage further ratification.

In accordance with [CBD COP decision 14/20](#), the open-ended working group will need to consider the outcomes of the extended Ad Hoc Technical Expert Group and make recommendations to the COP on how to address digital sequence information on genetic resources in the context of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework. The earlier the work of the AHTEG starts the more likely progress can be made in advance of consideration by the OEWG.

16. Integrating diverse perspectives

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?

As with any stakeholder group, the first step is to ensure their active involvement in discussion, and to ensure that their views and experience are taken fully into account in development of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework. IPLCs need to be a part of defining how the post-2020 global biodiversity framework takes account of their views and experience, how it might be used to facilitate the involvement of IPLCs in its implementation, and how to support the integration of traditional knowledge as a cross-cutting issue. This will include encouragement to Parties in including stakeholders in implementation.

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

This issue is being addressed in the Expert Workshop to Develop Recommendations for Possible gender Elements in the Post-2020 Global Biodiversity Framework which took place in New York from 11-12 April. The outcome from this meeting, convened by UN Women and the CBD Secretariat, with support from the Government of Canada and the CBD Friends of Gender Equality Group, should guide response to this question. This meeting was convened in response to [CBD COP decision 14/18](#) on the gender plan of action and [CBD COP decision 14/34](#) on the post-2020 process. We also note that some advice is already provided in [CBD/COP/14/9/ADD1](#).

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?

As with any stakeholder group, the first step is to ensure their active involvement in discussion, and to ensure that their views and experience are taken fully into account in development of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework. Representatives of the subnational governments, cities and other local authorities need to be a part of defining how the post-2020 global biodiversity framework might be used to facilitate their involvement in its implementation. This will include encouragement to Parties in including stakeholders in implementation.

Question: How can the post-2020 global biodiversity framework facilitate the involvement of civil society in the development and implementation of the framework?

As with any stakeholder group, the first step is to ensure their active involvement in discussion, and to ensure that their views and experience – including that from academia – are taken fully into account in development of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework. Representatives of civil society need to be a part of defining how the post-2020 global biodiversity framework might be used to facilitate the involvement of civil society in its implementation. This will include encouragement to Parties in including stakeholders in implementation.

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

As with any stakeholder group, the first step is to ensure their active involvement in discussion, and to ensure that their views and experience are taken fully into account in development of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework. Representatives of youth need to be a part of defining how the post-2020 global biodiversity framework might be used to facilitate the involvement of youth in its implementation. This will include encouragement to Parties in including all stakeholders in implementation.

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?

As with any stakeholder group, the first step is to ensure their active involvement in discussion, and to ensure that their views and experience are taken fully into account in development of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework. Representatives of the private sector need to be a part of defining how the post-2020 global biodiversity framework might be used to facilitate the involvement of the private sector in its implementation. This will include encouragement to Parties in including stakeholders in implementation.

UN Environment are engaged in a number of initiatives working with the private sector and finance sector, and would be willing to work to increase engagement in the post-2020 discussions if this would be helpful. For example, UNEP-WCMC has already been working with members of the oil, gas and mining sector, including their associations IPIECA and ICMM, to increase their understanding of the process now under way. This could be increased across other platforms and initiatives.

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

By taking advice from diverse and multiple perspectives during the discussions and negotiations, broadly communicating on those discussions and how they are proceeding, and by considering the roles that can be played by multiple stakeholder in delivery of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework. The latter would include encouraging Parties to include multiple stakeholders in their implementation plans.

17. Communication and outreach***Question: How should the post-2020 global biodiversity framework address issues related to communication and awareness.***

Communication and awareness is an ongoing issue, and should be regarded as an enabling activity which needs support at all levels from all relevant stakeholders including governments. As such it might be better to provide Parties and others with guidance on what is expected rather than including an explicit target within the post-2020 global biodiversity framework.

This is also an area where opportunities need to be found to increase the engagement of organizations with greater outreach opportunities, whether they be focused on communications or advocacy, or have access to in-person communication opportunities (such as through zoos, aquaria and botanic gardens). Advice needs to be sought from such organizations.

Question: 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?

In order to deliver in 2020 a post-2020 global biodiversity framework that is welcomed as THE global strategy on biodiversity, steps will need to be taken between now and the UN Biodiversity Conference in 2020 to do the following, all of which will require a strong element of communications.

- a) Increase recognition and understanding of the relevance and value of biodiversity and ecosystems to different sectors, and how biodiversity can be part of the solution to problems that some of those sectors are trying to address. This is essential to engagement with the Rio Conventions and SDGs and those implementing them (including other parts of the UN), and also to full implementation of mainstreaming, all of which is directly relevant to achieving transformational change. Resources include IPBES assessments, and assessments by organizations and processes, and opportunity is also provided by the launch of the next edition of the Global Biodiversity Outlook.
- b) Increase the engagement of stakeholders in a position to support implementation of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework, whether through positive action or decreasing negative impacts. This includes all of the types of stakeholder identified above, many of whom can be accessed through key focal organizations, associations or the like. The ground should be prepared so that in 2020 they felt able to get behind the post-2020 global biodiversity strategy and help make a real difference to implementation.
- c) Increase the consistency of messaging across conventions on biodiversity. Opportunity should also be sought for increased cooperation and collaboration across biodiversity-related conventions, the Rio Conventions, IPBES and others on communications and messaging so that opportunities to work in an increasingly coordinated manner are taken. This has already begun in a modest way as part of an UN Environment led 'synergies' project, but could be extended further.

18. Additional views on the scope and content of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework

The evidence from scenario analysis and modelling tells us that the 2050 Vision for Biodiversity is achievable, but that achieving it will require very significant transformational changes across various sectors of the economy and society – and unless such changes are implemented in the very near future, the loss of biodiversity will continue well beyond 2030.⁷ The implication of this is that the following will need to be addressed.

- a) Better understand how to effectively address the drivers of biodiversity loss that fall with constituents and in sectors beyond the perceived mandate of the Convention and its Protocols, but which are impacting on biodiversity and ecosystem services, so that issues such as the following can be successfully addressed: promotion of nature-based solutions in addressing climate change and land degradation; promotion of sustainable consumption and production for example through sustainable public procurement; promotion of sustainable agricultural practices, and biodiversity-positive commodity supply chains; promotion of circular economy with reduced resource requirements, and waste; promotion of a sustainable bio-economy for example through expanding the uptake of natural capital accounting; promotion of sound chemicals management; promotion of a rapid transition to renewable energy; etc.
- b) Use scenario analysis and modelling to help outline the strategies that will build upon the contributions of biodiversity and ecosystem services to achieving sustainable development, and responding to the objectives of other major human endeavours relating to climate change, land degradation, health and food and water security. This will help inform negotiators on a range of possible or plausible biodiversity futures under various assumptions of political, technological, and socio-economic development, along

⁷ Leclère D, Obersteiner M, Alkemade R, Almond R, Barrett M, Bunting G, Burgess N, Butchart S, et al. (2018). *Towards pathways bending the curve terrestrial biodiversity trends within the 21st century*. IIASA DOI:[10.22022/ESM/04-2018.15241](https://doi.org/10.22022/ESM/04-2018.15241).

with a range of policy or management options, exploring trajectories of biodiversity and ecosystem services into the future.

- c) In carrying out the activities above, engage from early on with institutions and organizations beyond the “usual suspects”, including building further relationships with multilateral agreements other than the biodiversity-related multilateral environmental agreements and the Rio Conventions, and expanding engagement with financial institutions and the private sector (and in particular industry associations), so that they become actively involved in both development and implementation of the post-2020 framework and any associated targets addressing their sectors.

Annex: Developing indicators for the post-2020 global biodiversity framework

Following input sought from its 60 partners, the Biodiversity Indicators Partnership submitted an information document to COP 14 entitled *Developing indicators for the post-2020 global biodiversity framework: Lessons from the Biodiversity Indicators Partnership* (CBD/COP/14/INF/40). In the margins of COP14 a side event was held to elicit further views from Parties and other bodies. This note takes the input from this event and the recommendations from the information document, and provides a further iteration of **recommendations for the scope of the indicator component of the post 2020 framework**.

- a) Post-2020 targets should be as SMART as possible to allow for the identification of clear and useful indicators. The establishment of SMART targets will help to improve alignment and relevance of indicators to the appropriate target. Time-bound targets will also allow indicators to more closely track progress towards targets.
- b) As per the experience of the BIP using the Biodiversity Indicator Development Framework at sub-national, national and global scales, the development of targets and indicators should be an iterative process, with the identification of indicators helping to refine the targets. This is consistent with the recommendation from COP to develop targets and indicators in parallel.
- c) While it is important to build on what already exists, the lack of a known existing indicator should not limit target development. From the experience of the BIP secretariat, it is still possible to identify datasets and indicators of which we were previously unaware, and there is often ongoing work that, with minimal support, could provide a new and innovative indicator ready for use. The EU-funded *Mind the Gap* project identified three new indicators ready for global use, and 39 indicators either under active development or requiring further development before being ready for global use. Under the same project, three new indicators were developed to fill gaps in the existing indicator framework for the Aichi Biodiversity Targets.
- d) While the target terminology adopted within the post-2020 global biodiversity framework has not yet been defined, efforts should continue to identify and mobilise indicators which can track actions as well as outcomes. Indicators which can track actions, policy responses and policy uptake, and the success of enabling mechanisms will be required, including resource mobilisation, capacity building and mainstreaming metrics (see for example [CBD COP decision 14/3](#)) which references the need for mainstreaming metrics).
- e) Any voluntary national biodiversity commitments to be developed under the CBD should ideally be developed by countries making use of an agreed common framework, to facilitate and enable informed and effective conservation action, monitoring, and reporting, and to enable collective commitments and ambition to be determined in relation to global goals and targets.
- f) New technologies should be employed to track and communicate progress on the targets more dynamically and continually in the future, using indicator visualization platforms and model-based scenarios to support an adaptive management approach that allows for continual improvements and feedback to actions to meet the targets.
- g) In particular, the creation of a post-2020 target tracker could ensure that measurable and meaningful indicators are available from the start, to track progress toward achievement of the post-2020 targets. The target tracker could show the agreed targets and their associated date stamped indicator updates at national and global levels using the kind of visualisation now online through the Biodiversity Indicators Dashboard, using both historic trend data and where available any forward extrapolations or modelled data to show the timeframe between 2020 and 2030. Such a system could also integrate the scenario models being developed for IPBES to allow Parties and others the ability to explore and visualize alternative futures and pathways towards the targets and the 2050 Vision for Biodiversity. The target tracker would also fulfil a role in ensuring transparency and visibility of indicator data to promote trust and confidence in the underpinning sources.
- h) A review of the use of indicators by Parties in their 6th National Reports would help to reinforce use of indicators at the national level in the post-2020 period.