



April 15, 2019

CANADIAN SUBMISSION

Notification 2019-008

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 (GBF). The process required that an initial discussion document summarizing and analysing the initial views of Parties and observers be made available in January 2019. In line with the request, the Executive Secretary has prepared an initial discussion document on the post-2020 global biodiversity framework, with the guidance of the co-chairs of the Open-Ended Inter-Sessional Working Group to support the preparation of the post-2020 GBF.

The document reviews relevant decisions, summarizing the initial views of partners and observers and provides a number of questions to stimulate the discussion. Parties and observers were encouraged, through Notification 2019-008, to provide further views on the post-2020 global biodiversity framework. In response to the notification, Canada is pleased to provide the following views on the questions proposed in the discussion document.

A. Structure of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework

What could constitute an effective structure for the post-2020 GBF, what should its different elements be, and how should they be organized?

- The current structure of the strategic goals continues to be relevant. However, the list of 20 targets resulted in a slightly disjointed and disorganized vision of the actions that need to be taken on biodiversity - a scattered approach that is too broad for some targets and far too issue-specific in others.
- There is a need for re-assessing the organization of the targets to focus more on targets and actions that will be the most effective in positively influencing the state of biodiversity, and avoiding duplication between targets when possible. This could include alternative methods for organizing the targets. It would be useful to develop a conceptual framework that allows for the visualization of global biodiversity issues in a concrete manner.
- The number of targets should not increase beyond 20 and could possibly be reduced in order to simplify the framework. The use of sub-targets should be explored to simplify the structure but provide flexibility in focusing attention on specific issues, including those not currently addressed in the current set of targets, providing that there is a clear need based on evidence. One possible model could involve fewer, simpler targets with more general



language, supported by 3-5 specific sub-elements/sub-targets/milestones/indicators, similar to the model used for the Sustainable Development Goals.

B. Ambition of the post-2020 GBF

In the context of the post-2020 GBF, what would “ambitious” specifically mean?

- An ambitious set of global post-2020 biodiversity targets is needed as part of the Post 2020 GBF that builds on the existing Aichi targets. These targets would provide a framework for furthering the 3 objectives of the Convention on Biological Diversity and result in a net-positive effect on biodiversity.
- Existing global targets, their level of ambition and target statements should be reviewed, taking stock of the current strategic plan in terms of progress made and the limitations, to ensure that (1) each target remains valid for furthering the 3 objectives of the Convention and the 2050 Vision for Biodiversity and that (2) the level of ambition of each target is commensurate with what is required based on available evidence and strong rationale.
- The multiple ways in which ambition can be achieved should be explored as part of the process of developing the Post 2020 GBF, including through:
 - the addition of new target elements (or sub-targets) to address gaps or focus actions on specific or priority issues;
 - the adoption of revised or new milestones to better track progress towards 2030, similar to those currently proposed in the Aichi target quick guides;
 - when appropriate and supported by evidence, through the adoption of measurable targets/target elements.

C. 2050 Vision for Biodiversity

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 GBF and what actions are needed between now and 2050 to reach the 2050 Vision?

- The 2050 Vision for Biodiversity remains valid. The scope and content of the Post 2020 GBF should reflect what is needed to effectively implement the CBD and effectively drive us forward towards achieving the 2050 Vision. The scope and content of the post-2020 framework should cover all elements of the Vision:
 - Biodiversity values need to be reflected in planning, development, policy and decision-making processes;



- biodiversity needs to be conserved, restored and sustainably used through effective conservation/restoration programs and measures; and
- with effective regulations to ensure the sustainable use of biodiversity and ecosystem services are maintained to sustain a healthy planet and meet the needs of all people (including those of IPLCs and vulnerable groups).
- Some priority actions that are needed between now and 2050 include:
 - (1) meeting commitments under the current strategic plan,
 - (2) addressing gaps to meet all three objectives of the Convention,
 - (3) improving synergies with other processes such as UNFCCC for synergistic action and co-benefits,
 - (4) raising society's awareness of biodiversity values and implications of loss of biodiversity and ecosystems, and how they can positively contribute through the identification of possible actions,
 - (5) strengthening accountability including effective NBSAPs, monitoring and reporting,
 - (6) strengthening biodiversity mainstreaming by incorporating biodiversity values in national planning and development processes, sectors, policy and decision-making and economics and
 - (7) the mobilization of necessary financial resources to achieve that.
- As part of preparations of the Post 2020 GBF, work should be done to explore how to connect the Aichi Targets, the post-2020 targets, and the 2050 Vision in such a way as to clearly map out where we want to be in 2050 on each of the targets, with interim 10-year targets as milestones towards the longer-term 2050 Vision.

D. Mission

What would be the elements and content of an actionable 2030 mission statement for the post-2020 GBF?

- The Post 2020 GBF mission statement and the targets need to be simple to make them easier to communicate.
- The mission statement could be presented as an “apex” target that guides all of the CBD’s post-2020 targets. In this way, the current mission statement¹ remains relevant, but should be simplified to be made more communicative and understandable for the general public, and to focus on the areas that fall under the direct purview of the CBD.

¹ “take effective and urgent action to halt the loss of biodiversity in order to ensure that by 2020 (2030) ecosystems are resilient and continue to provide essential services, thereby securing the planet's variety of life, and contributing to human well-being, and poverty eradication. To ensure this, pressures on biodiversity are reduced, ecosystems are restored, biological resources are sustainably used and benefits arising out of utilization of genetic resources are shared in a fair and equitable manner; adequate financial resources are provided, capacities are enhanced, biodiversity issues and values mainstreamed, appropriate policies are effectively implemented, and decision-making is based on sound science and the precautionary approach”



E. Biodiversity Targets

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

- Current targets should be revised and new targets developed with the objective of having SMART targets (specific, measurable, action-oriented, realistic, and time-bound).
- While the qualitative-aspirational aspects of the targets remain important, measurable, quantitative goals should be set for targets or their sub-targets/elements where appropriate and/or supported by evidence-based indicators.
- The current set of targets could be assessed using criteria related to SMART-ness to inform the revision of current targets or the development of new elements. The following criteria could be used:
 - (1) specificity and relevance of the target name, statement and element,
 - (2) measurability of the target and its elements and how they can be made more measurable, current/potential scalable global indicators to support effective monitoring and reporting,
 - (3) action-oriented: target is actionable,
 - (4) realistic: target can be achieved, and
 - (5) time-bound: most appropriate timing for the target, its elements and milestones.

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

- The current set of Aichi Biodiversity targets should be used as the basis for the Post 2020 targets but targets need to be assessed in order to evaluate their relevance, their SMART-ness and how they can be improved, updated and more effectively organized (see A. Structure – above).
- In developing the post 2020 targets, existing CBD commitments, progress in achieving the current set of targets, and lessons learned and gaps need to be considered. This work should be further informed by considering recent assessments on the state of biodiversity such as the upcoming Global Biodiversity Outlook and the IPBES Global Assessment.

(c) How should the set of targets in the post-2020 GBF align with other global targets, including those adopted under the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development?

- The post-2020 global biodiversity targets should be aligned with other global targets such as those of other Rio Conventions and the 2030 Sustainable Development Agenda (but note that the biodiversity-related SDGs are almost an exact copy of the Aichi Targets), to the extent possible and where relevant. The contribution of the post-2020 GBF to achieving



other global agreements should be captured in the Post 2020 GBF to improve synergies and awareness.

- CBD should remain the main international instrument for biodiversity conservation that establishes global biodiversity targets. Other relevant global targets related to biodiversity could be integrated into the CBD framework as sub-elements of its targets to improve synergies, avoid duplication and facilitate reporting (e.g. wetlands target under the RAMSAR Convention).

F. Voluntary commitments and contributions

What form should voluntary commitments for biodiversity take and how should these relate to or be reflected in the post-2020 GBF?

- NBSAPs already represent countries' voluntary commitments towards meeting global biodiversity targets. Parties should be working with the scientific community to better understand where additional efforts are needed, rather than focusing on what Parties are willing to achieve.
- Proposals for early voluntary commitments should be welcomed from key Parties, in key areas, and/or from key stakeholders to supplement efforts that will be made under the revised targets, as a way to improve biodiversity mainstreaming and the mobilization of other sectors of society and to raise ambition globally. Parties need to further explore whether voluntary commitments should be part of the post-2020 GBF, or be part of a parallel supporting mechanism.
- Parties should consider the value of reflecting voluntary commitments and contributions in the post-2020 GBF as they could provide an opportunity to demonstrate biodiversity efforts that have been successful, particularly by non-Parties such as businesses, civil society and others, and stimulate more engagement. Joint initiatives between civil society organizations, the private sector and sub-national governments could be created. Those could provide enough momentum to be sustained throughout political cycles and result in significant biodiversity outcomes and serve as models globally.

G. Relationship between the post-2020 GBF and other relevant processes

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 GBF?



- The post-2020 global biodiversity targets should be well aligned with the 2030 Sustainable Development Agenda, as well as other processes, such as the strategic goals of the two other Rio Conventions and the various other biodiversity-related Multilateral Environmental Agreements (MEAs). This should include looking for commonalities with other international and national commitments, as well as avoiding duplication.
- See question E(c) also.

H. Mainstreaming

How can the post-2020 GBF incorporate or support the mainstreaming of biodiversity across society and economies at large?

- Some aspects of mainstreaming are already addressed under Targets 6 and 7 related to fisheries, agriculture, forestry and aquaculture. Considerations are needed for including additional production sectors and how these existing targets and potentially new elements are related. For instance, production related targets and elements could be integrated into an overarching “production sectors” target.
- Target 4 on sustainable production and consumption could serve as a chapeau target for production sectors. This target could also look at the sustainability of supply chains and address various aspects of individual sectors but with a focus on the conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity.
- Enhancing collaboration with other international agreements related to productive sectors using a networking approach or other effective tools to exchange information and best practices, as is done through the Friends of Ecosystem-based Approaches, could build synergies, raise awareness and improve the mainstreaming of biodiversity considerations into the sectors.
- Some of the priorities identified for the Post 2020 GBF to attain the 2050 Vision (see Question C) include furthering the integration of biodiversity values into planning, development, decision making and other processes and this will have a significant impact in terms of mainstreaming biodiversity. This implies a better understanding of the multiple values of biodiversity.

I. Relationship with the current Strategic Plan

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?



- One of the initial challenges in implementing the Aichi targets was the time it took to update NBSAPs. Efforts should be made to streamline the process of updating NBSAPs in order to maximise the amount of time available for implementation. This could include closer harmonization of national and international targets and indicators, streamlined planning and reporting, as well as possible tools to facilitate the mapping of national biodiversity targets to global biodiversity targets.
- The current Aichi targets and the world's progress in achieving them could be used as baseline data for post-2020 actions and results. However, in order to achieve this, the targets must be measurable.

K. Indicators

What indicators, in addition to those already identified in decision XIII/2, are needed to monitor progress in the implementation of the post-2020 GBF at the national, regional and global scales?

- Existing CBD indicators, indicators adopted in other relevant fora (e.g. forest-related targets) as well as indicators from international initiatives such as the Biodiversity Indicators Partnership should be considered as potential indicators for the revised set of targets under the post 2020 framework.
- Indicators need to be considered and developed at the same time as the Post 2020 targets are developed. These indicators should be SMART and supported by globally available datasets, or built in such a way that they can aggregate domestic efforts to track global progress.
- Indicators should ideally cover all targets/elements of the targets but a core set of relevant indicators could be selected that could be tracked globally and that would help harmonize and facilitate global reporting.

L. Implementation and NBSAPs

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 GBF and how should these be reflected in the framework?

- Having better consistency across NBSAPs is important so that they are comparable and more easily consolidated to assess global progress on biodiversity.
- Efforts should be made to strengthen the accountability of CBD Parties towards their own global and national biodiversity commitments, including those established under a post-



2020 GBF via their NBSAPs. This could include enhanced (yet facilitative) reporting and review mechanisms under the CBD.

- Globally, to the extent possible, the updated global biodiversity targets should be measurable and supported by clear and meaningful indicators and/or measurable targets elements (or sub-targets), to allow for a more globally harmonized reporting approach.
- A more effective implementation can also be achieved through better alignment of the updated NBSAPs with the new set of global biodiversity targets in order to track progress and gaps more efficiently, but also to allow for a more timely updating of NBSAPs that is less resource-intensive.

M. Resource mobilization

How should the post-2020 GBF address resource mobilization and what implications does this have for the scope and content of the framework?

- It is important to collectively mobilize additional resources for biodiversity from a wide variety of sources, including domestic public budgets, official development assistance, and private sector investment .
- Biodiversity aid flows have reached \$8.7 billion annually, representing close to a doubling of ODA since 2010. The countries that are the least adequately funded are typically developing nations with high biodiversity and many threatened species.
- Creative and innovative ways to mobilize additional resources for biodiversity are urgently needed, especially given that the recent doubling of biodiversity-related ODA has seemingly not had a major impact on biodiversity loss. As per the recommendations of the High-Level Panel on Global Assessment of Resources for Implementing the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011–2020, enhancing synergies, addressing trade-offs and promoting alignment across sectoral policies are prerequisites for effective resource mobilization. There should also be a deeper involvement of the private sector to leverage their knowledge and best practices. This would involve a scope change for the private sector from that of consultative to an active role in the framework development, implementation and delivery. Carefully designed and scientifically defensible offset protocols may be one avenue to mobilize additional resources for the protection of biodiversity. Providing payments for ecosystem services or protocols which incentivize the adoption of sustainable production practices may be an effective avenue for mobilization. Market-based approaches are effective in that they can allow for varied solutions, often require less resources than a regulatory approach and convey that governments alone are not responsible for sustaining nature.

N. Financial mechanisms



How can the Global Environment Facility (GEF) support the timely provision of financial resources to assist eligible Parties in implementing the post-2020 GBF?

- The GEF continues to play an important role as the financial mechanism of the CBD. The GEF needs to continue to ensure that (a) its biodiversity programming is well-aligned with the CBD's 2011-2020 Strategic Plan and the upcoming post-2020 global biodiversity framework, and (b) that the amount of funding available under the GEF Biodiversity Focal Area for country allocations be maximised, and (c) that biodiversity co-benefits are fully captured when addressing climate change and land degradation through the GEF's impact programs and use of nature-based solutions.
- Based on the GEF Independent Evaluation Office's sixth comprehensive evaluation of the GEF (OPS6) report, GEF-sponsored biodiversity projects are performing at a high level in terms of satisfactory outcomes. A recent COP Decision (Decision **14/23**) invites the GEF to undertake a number of actions to further improve the effectiveness of the financial mechanism to assist eligible Parties in implementing the post-2020 global biodiversity framework.
- The GEF could also play a key role in convening Parties, diverse actors and financial organizations to encourage the development and growth of innovative financing, such as green bonds, impact investments, revolving funds, and others.

O. Review process

What additional mechanisms, if any, are required to support the review of implementation of the post-2020 GBF and how should these be integrated into the framework?

- A review processes that is technical, objective, transparent, non-adversarial and non-punitive in nature should be part of the Post 2020 Framework. Options that regularly assess progress towards the global biodiversity targets should be developed for consideration in developing the framework.
- Effective models used by other bodies such as those of the UNFCCC or the OECD should be assessed to inform CBD discussions and develop potential options for CBD Parties.
- The review process should also be strengthened through improved, clearer and more measurable global targets, in turn supported by updated and improved NBSAPs with national targets that contribute to global progress. Targets should be tracked with a harmonized set of global indicators, supported by effective monitoring.

P. Relationship between the Convention and the Protocols



What are the issues associated with biosafety under the Convention and what are the implications for the post-2020 GBF?

- It should be noted that not all Parties to the CBD are Parties to its Cartagena Protocol. As such, care should be taken to ensure that any target related to biosafety should focus on Parties related commitments under the Convention. A post-2020 target related to biosafety should focus on CBD Parties' commitments and policies more generically, rather than on the implementation of the Cartagena Protocol, so that it applies to all CBD Parties.

What are the issues associated with access and benefit-sharing under the Convention and what are the implications for the post-2020 GBF?

- The third objective of the Convention is the fair and equitable sharing of genetic resources and their benefits (ABS), but not all Parties have ratified the Nagoya Protocol on ABS. A post-2020 target related to ABS should focus on the operationalization of ABS systems and policies more generically, rather than on the implementation of the Nagoya Protocol, so that it applies to all CBD Parties.

Q. Integrating diverse perspectives

Overall position for Question Q:

- As per COP Decision 14/34, the overarching principles guiding the preparatory process for the post-2020 global biodiversity framework remain valid and as such it must ensure the participation of all relevant stakeholders through a process that is participatory, inclusive, gender responsive, comprehensive, iterative, visible and transparent.
- The important role of women, Indigenous peoples and local communities, and youth, should be recognized and their full and effective participation could be ensured through an overarching element for the implementation of the post-2020 GBF.
- Canada has an ongoing domestic engagement process aligned with these principles that engages all levels of government, IPLCs, youth, women, civil society, industry and other stakeholders to get their views on all elements being considered in the development of the Post 2020 GBF and related goals and targets.

(a) How can the post-2020 GBF facilitate the involvement of indigenous peoples and local communities and support the integration of traditional knowledge as a cross-cutting issue?

- The Post 2020 GBF should highlight the significant role of IPLCs and the importance of their effective collaboration to achieve global targets. Their participation in the work of the Convention should be encouraged through renewed efforts to implement Article 8j. At the



international level, IPLCs are already engaged in the work of the Convention through Article 8j of the Convention and will have opportunities to participate in OEWG meetings and other meetings.

- The Post 2020 GBF language should respect existing models and mechanisms used by Parties for coordinating with IPLCs on biodiversity issues.
- The consideration of the needs and knowledge of IPLCs could be included as an overarching principle that applies to all of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework. Target 18 on traditional knowledge and sustainable customary should however be part of the post-2020 GBF.

(b) How should gender issues be reflected in the scope and content of the post-2020 GBF?

- Through the COP-14 decision, Parties have agreed that the process for developing the post-2020 global biodiversity framework “*will be gender-responsive by systematically integrating a gender perspective and ensuring appropriate representation, particularly of women and girls, in the process.*” The decision also welcomed the advice for Parties, the Secretariat and other relevant organizations, to enable a gender-responsive and gender-balanced process for the development of the GBF.
- Considerations of gender equality and the role of women in the implementation of the CBD could be included as an overarching principle of the post-2020 GBF.

(c) How should issues related to subnational governments, cities and other local authorities be reflected in the scope and content of the post-2020 GBF?

- The Post 2020 GBF should highlight the important role of subnational governments, cities and other local authorities and their effective collaboration to achieve global targets. It should also encourage their participation in the work of the Convention. One concrete deliverable that Parties could agree to would be to renew the 2011-2020 “Plan of action on subnational governments, cities and other local authorities for biodiversity” for the period of 2020-2030.
- The Post 2020 GBF language should respect existing models and mechanisms used by Parties for coordinating with subnational governments, cities and local authorities on biodiversity issues.

(d) How can the post-2020 GBF facilitate the involvement of civil society in the development and implementation of the framework?

- Civil society and other stakeholders will have the opportunity to participate in OEWG meetings and other relevant meetings as part of the Post 2020 process.



- The Post 2020 framework language should respect existing domestic approaches for coordinating with civil society on biodiversity issues.
- The Post 2020 framework could refer to the need for Parties to explore how civil society is currently involved, areas where improvements should be made, as well as potential roles and options for their involvement in the implementation phase, including through possible voluntary commitments.

(e) How can the post-2020 GBF facilitate the involvement of youth in the development and implementation of the framework?

- The Post 2020 framework should highlight the important role of youth and their effective collaboration to achieving the global targets and encourage youth participation in the work of the CBD.

(f) How should issues related to the engagement of the private sector be reflected in the scope and content of the post-2020 GBF?

- Engagement of a wider range of financial and private institutions needs to be strengthened, at all levels and from all sources, to support the implementation of the post-2020 framework.
- Private sector and other stakeholders will have the opportunity to participate in OEWG meetings and other relevant meetings and this will supplement existing domestic approaches.
- The Post 2020 GBF should reflect the need to increase efforts in order to achieve a deeper involvement of the private sector so that they become actively engaged in the implementation of the Post 2020 GBF. This will need to be supported by a better understanding of the values of biodiversity and positive incentives for action. One possible way to more actively engage sectors is through voluntary commitments (see Question F).
- The Post 2020 framework should make references to the long term strategic approach on mainstreaming that is under development.

How should the post-2020 GBF reflect diverse and multiple perspectives?

- See overall position for question Q – above.

R. Communication and outreach

How should the post-2020 GBF 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?

- A specific target on public awareness and biodiversity should be included and as such Aichi Target 1 remains relevant and important for a post-2020 framework.
- While helpful in supporting Target 1, the CBD communication strategy will not deliver on Target 1 on its own. As a result, focus needs to be placed on efforts by Parties and a broad group of stakeholders, Indigenous peoples and local communities, and others to increase awareness of biodiversity issues. This should include enhancing people's connectedness with nature, and their ability to take action. Personal experiences and connections with the natural world provide powerful benefits for individual and societal health, well-being, and resilience and are also the foundation of lifelong support of and commitment to biodiversity conservation.
- A renewed Target 1 could include more specific action milestones for Parties to use in their updated NBSAPs, as well clearer, more consistent and measurable ways to report on and track progress.

Possible Thematic Groups / Meetings needed during the post-2020 process:

Canada proposes the following preliminary views and ideas regarding possible thematic meetings and technical groups that might be required to further develop elements of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework:

- There is a need for subject experts to have an opportunity get together to discuss their areas and propose changes/new targets, indicators, milestones, and other topics.
- The thematic groups' focus should be to take a deep dive on specific themes/targets, in particular to a) aggregate and examine the evidence base regarding that theme/target, progress and challenges in meeting it; and b) as a result of the evidence base, propose options for new targets with clear indicators/sub-targets/milestones in each theme/target area, and/or key questions/options for Parties to decide upon at subsequent OEWG meetings.
- In terms of possible thematic groups:
 - Accountability: It is a cross-cutting theme that most Parties seem to agree with, but more thought is needed on "how" to enhance accountability. This thematic group could develop a stronger CBD review package, including some standard guidance on how every target could be more measurable, better alignment of NBSAPs, and possible review mechanisms.



- It is likely not feasible or efficient to have 20 thematic groups. Key thematic areas could be created for experts that are in closely-related fields. This could be organized as follows:
 - Conservation and restoration of ecosystems (targets 5, 11, 14 and 15)
 - Species diversity (targets 12 and 13)
 - Sustainable use (targets 2, 4, 6, 7, 16)
 - Threats to biodiversity (targets 8, 9, 10 + Biosafety)