IUCN proposals on the Post-2020 Global Biodiversity Framework in response to CBD Notification 2019-075

September 2019

These proposals are submitted in response to Notification 2019-075 for consideration for the Post-2020 global biodiversity framework, without prejudice to IUCN's final position. In some cases, more than one suggestion is made, for example wording for possible successors to the Aichi Targets. This is because until the emerging framework and its structure are clear, it is difficult to suggest specific content. In addition, debate on ideal formulations is ongoing and no firm conclusions have been reached regarding IUCN's final position.

The rationale: a planetary emergency

The post-2020 global biodiversity framework should be underpinned by a strong rationale that emphasizes that we face a planetary emergency (as shown in the recent IPBES Global Assessment Report on Biodiversity and Ecosystem Services); and that a complete change to the current way of living - transformational change - is vital. Decisive action at scale (focussed on all components of biodiversity: genes, species and ecosystems) is imperative from local to global levels, from all countries and all sectors across all realms (land, freshwater and ocean) to secure the planet's life-supporting 'safety net'. The rationale should also stress that climate change is exacerbating this crisis, and point out clearly that ramping up nature conservation will make a significant contribution to solving the climate emergency: nature-based solutions to climate change can provide over 1/3 of the cost-effective climate mitigation needed between now and 2030 to stabilize warming to below 2°C**.**

All elements (i.e. Vision, Mission, goals and targets) of the framework should be outcome-oriented. We agree that every element should be linked not only to the 2050 Vision, but also to each other. All elements for 2030 should be milestones towards the 2050 Vision.

The post-2020 global biodiversity framework should serve as a universal framework for action on biodiversity, promote coherent action and synergies with related processes, be based on a clear theory of change, with an easily communicated conceptual framework.

This paper outlines IUCN's current thinking on the elements (i.e. "targets", "goals" and other components, whatever they are labelled) that comprise the new structure.

Scope, ambition and content

The post-2020 global biodiversity framework (hereafter 'the framework') should reflect a logical arrangement of its elements that communicate the imperative to attain an overarching objective (Mission for 2030) and the long-term goal (Vision for 2050).

Scope and ambition: the framework should aim to achieve "no net loss" of biodiversity by 2030, and through recovery and restoration, achieve a "net gain" by 2050. This is in line with "bending the curve" of biodiversity loss, and with the concept of "retention targets".

Given the timeframes necessary for ecological recovery and restoration, articulating such a level of ambition for 2050 reveals the urgency of implementation by 2030 of immediate actions to abate threats and begin restoration, necessary for the achievement of both the 2030 Mission and 2050 Vision.

The framework needs to fully align and contribute to the 2030 Sustainable Development Goals and targets. Continuous and urgent action is essential towards those SDG targets with a timeline of 2020 (reflecting current Aichi targets), with suitable adjustment in level of ambition to 2030.

The framework should be a unified action plan that integrates and achieves the three objectives of the CBD in a balanced way including targets aimed at enhancing implementation of access and benefit sharing. It should also align with the other two Rio Conventions and the biodiversity-related conventions and processes.

Targets should be science-based, and formulated such that they can be disaggregated to reflect necessary contributions from any actor (and reflect differentiated responsibilities). As such, each national target needs to

connect to global targets to make the national level contribution to the global target transparent and accountable, and such that the sum of all national targets equals the global target ('*Add-upability'*).

The framework should include stronger implementation and transparent accountability mechanisms for all its component elements. Monitoring and review processes that utilize global-scale and relevant national and sectoral indicators should be adopted together with a mechanism for 'global stocktakes' to enable countries and all actors to 'ratchet up' (enhance ambition and implementation efforts).

The whole framework (Vision, Mission and targets - successors to the Aichi Targets) should comprise elements that are science-based and SMART.

Voluntary contributions: Clarity around both this concept and terminology is essential. It is anticipated to encompass voluntary contributions from both Parties and from non-state actors.

For Parties, voluntary contributions will encompass those actions which go above and beyond national responsibilities to deliver science-based targets.

Meanwhile, science-based targets will allow non-state actors to address drivers and make explicit contributions for biodiversity. Such targets quantify the mitigation of pressures needed to increase the status of biodiversity and address actions necessary to remove threats to biodiversity in the area over which any actor has responsibility.

Post 2020, voluntary commitments for biodiversity from non-state actors should be encouraged and enhanced; the magnitude of commitments (at all scales) and the number of contributors will necessarily need to expand.

Vision for 2050

The 2050 Vision "Living in Harmony with Nature" should be retained, with 'back casting' from 2050 as a useful guide to specific trajectories over the next 30 years. A small number of outcome oriented (i.e. biodiversity status) long-term targets should accompany the 2050 Vision: "landing lights" for 2030 to help link the elements of the framework to the 2050 Vision and in effect explain how it will be achieved. Articulating such a level of ambition for 2050 emphasises the urgency of implementation by 2030 of short-term actions necessary for the achievement of such targets.

Suggested 'landing light' targets – to track Living in Harmony with Nature in concrete terms linked to the three objectives of the CBD – are as follows:

The conservation and sustainable use of biological diversity:

- *By 2050, all threatened species have recovered, and all use of species is sustainable, such that no species faces extinction risk elevated by human actions (as indicated by a Red List Index of 1)*
- *By 2050, all ecosystems have been restored, and all use of ecosystems is sustainable, such that no ecosystem faces a risk of collapse elevated by human actions*
- *By 2050, genetic diversity of all species is maintained*
- *By 2050 the stewards of biodiversity are able to benefit from the use of biodiversity in a fair and equitable way*

Mission for 2030

The Mission (sometimes referred to as an 'Apex target') for 2030 should reflect both a desired biodiversity outcome and a galvanising action-oriented statement. It should be inspirational and motivating, a positive statement of what needs to be done to achieve the 2050 Vision.

The 2030 Mission should be outcome oriented, focusing on the desired status of biodiversity. It should be an actionable *planetary target* for biodiversity, and be forward looking and enabling; a 'call to action' that communicates why this matters to people. The Mission for 2030 must aim to halt the loss of biodiversity by 2030, and achieve recovery and restoration by 2050. This is in line with "bending the curve".

A suggested Mission for 2030 is:

- *Halt the net loss of species, ecosystems and genetic diversity [living nature] by 2030; [as milestones to] restore and recover biodiversity to ensure a world of people "living in harmony with nature" by 2050.*

This would imply that collectively, the post-2020 biodiversity framework would:

- *Halt the net loss of biodiversity by 2030; restore and recover biodiversity to ensure a world of people "living in harmony with nature" by 2050.*
- *By 2030, effectively safeguard and begin restoration of living nature*
- *By 2030 no more net loss of species, ecosystems, and genetic diversity; towards net gain*

Additional suggested formulations for Mission /Apex outcome /Planetary Target(s) for 2030 that aim to increase the status of the components of biodiversity:

Species:

A focus on species is essential but formulations such as 'No species extinction caused by human activities', while essential, are not ambitious enough: they would not preclude a great deal of biodiversity destruction.

Improved formulations could include:

- *Halt extinctions as of 2020, and halt further net increases in extinction risk by 2030, towards restoration and recovery of species populations by 2050*
- *No more net deterioration in species survival by 2030*
- *Net positive impact on species survival by 2030*

Ecosystems:

- *Halt further net loss of ecosystems by 2030, towards restoration and recovery of ecosystems by 2050*
- *Protect and begin to Restore nature by 2030 for the benefit of People and the Planet, in support of the Sustainable Development Goals*

Goals and targets for 2030

It is imperative that the current framework, overall, is strengthened – and not weakened. Clearly, implementation of the framework, and a means to measure progress, is also critical. There will also be a need to address gaps in the current Strategic Plan such as Illegal Wildlife Trade.

Goals: IUCN suggests maintaining the five goals of the current Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020 (that align with the DPSIR framework). As with all the elements of the framework, goals and targets need to be developed with reference to the overall framework and organized in such way that makes it clear how the different elements are linked, and how they contribute to the 2050 Vision.

Targets: The Mission for 2030 should be supported by targets formulated in terms of desired outcomes for biodiversity (i.e., successors to current Aichi Targets 5, 12, 13). Such goals and targets should reflect the status of biodiversity.

Structure: such outcomes – for species, ecosystems and genetic diversity – need to be supported by action targets to tackle direct pressures on biodiversity and their drivers (i.e., successors to current Aichi Targets 6-11). Targets to enhance the benefits of biodiversity to people and nature (i.e., successors to current Aichi Targets 14-16), and targets to support implementation (i.e., successors to current Aichi Targets 17-20) are essential to achieve the Mission as are targets focused on the underlying causes of biodiversity loss (i.e., successors to current Aichi Targets 1-4). Such an arrangement is, in effect, an evolution of the current structure.

National level targets: Parties should formulate national level targets that will collectively contribute to the global target, and using the same metrics and indicators. Further, targets will need to be supported by a clear, analytical rationale based on science (why is the target set at a particular level?), indicating its contribution to the attainment of the Mission. They should be able to be disaggregated and formulated in such a manner that Parties and stakeholders from all sectors can trace their contributions to their achievement.

The achievement of the 2030 Mission requires action at scale to improve the status of biodiversity. Such action should be incorporated into global targets with explicit outcomes. Increasing ambition will clearly be necessary for *in situ* conservation. It will be essential to retain and restore the integrity and intactness of natural or near-natural ecosystems over the planet's terrestrial, marine, and freshwater surface; improve ecological representation (of species and ecosystems); conserve species (prevent extinctions, maintain abundance of non-threatened species) and retain all essential ecosystem services. Targets should take into account the precise conditions and opportunities of each country (see below).

The Decade on Ecosystem Restoration 2021 – 2030 should reinforce ecosystem and soil restoration as a delivery mechanism for the 2050 Vision: a global call for restoration at scale.

Indicators: It is vital that we establish a means to measure progress towards goals and targets at the same time that the framework is developed. Existing indicators (as mobilized through the Biodiversity Indicators Partnership, BIP) and associated data sets should be utilised, as well as new means to track progress. Indicators need to be relevant to new targets of the framework, and consistent with the measurement of progress towards the SDGs and other MEAs. This allows for consistency and comparability across assessments and monitoring processes, while simultaneously reducing the reporting burden. It should be possible to aggregate and disaggregate indicators at global and national level scales. They should capture the contributions of all involved in the implementation of the framework, including national level commitments, and contributions by non-State actors.

It is essential that BIP indicators are sustainably funded to provide up to date, reliable and available information about progress towards the framework, throughout the reporting period.

Successors to Aichi Targets

Successor to Target 5 (two possible alternative formulations):

- *Degradation, fragmentation and loss of all natural habitats are addressed in order to generate net positive biodiversity outcomes by 2030, with the goal of restoration and recovery of all natural ecosystems by 2050*

- *Degradation, and [net] loss of all natural habitats to be halted by 2030*

Successor to Target 6:

- *By 2030, the pressure of illegal and unsustainable utilization and trade in wild fauna and flora is reduced, contributing to the conservation of biodiversity and human well-being.*

Successor to Target 9:

- *Halting the loss of biodiversity caused by invasive alien species by 2030, by preventing their impacts in [100% of] the most vulnerable areas, regulating [50% of] the most harmful invasive alien species, and effectively managing [50% of] the most significant pathways of introduction, such that their impacts are reversed through restoration and recovery by 2050.*

Protected areas and other effective area-based conservation measures (OECMs): these are a key tool in securing conservation of biodiversity. Post 2020 Protected Areas and OECMs should be expanded to maintain ecological integrity, intactness and connectivity and should represent all areas of importance for biodiversity and ecosystem services. All such areas should be effectively managed and equitably governed. All sites of global significance for biodiversity, including key biodiversity areas (KBAs), should be documented, retained, and restored through well-managed systems of protected areas and other effective area-based conservation measures, to cover by 2030 at least 30% of the planet.

Post 2020, it will be of crucial importance is to identify and recognize appropriately those areas that are already conserved through the actions of indigenous peoples and local communities, as well as private actors, and other areas that will be established that meet the definition of OECMs.

Connectivity needs to be improved to develop ecological networks, mitigate fragmentation for migratory species, gene flow, and support adaptation to climate change. Viable areas of natural or semi-natural habitat need to be maintained within and around production systems.

Successor to Target 12:

- *Halt overall species' population declines by 2030, prevent human-driven extinctions of known threatened species, and improve the status of 30% of known threatened species by 2030*

Successor to Target 13 (two possible alternative formulations):

- *Establish and share technologies for measurement of genetic diversity by 2030, such that by 2050 it can be demonstrated that genetic diversity of all species is maintained at levels natural through the Earth's history*

- *By 2030, the genetic diversity within species of wild and domesticated animals, plants and microbes, including socio-economically and culturally valuable species, is maintained, and strategies have been developed and implemented for minimizing genetic erosion and safeguarding adaptive potential*

Successor to Target 14:

- *By 2030, legal use and trade of wild fauna and flora at sustainable levels enhances the conservation of biodiversity and the benefits to human well-being*

Successor to Target 15 (two possible alternative formulations):

It is important to prioritise biodiversity benefits (prioritising biodiversity in restoration yields benefits ten times higher than not doing so):

- *By 2030, ecosystem resilience and the contribution of biodiversity to carbon stocks has been enhanced through ecosystem-based approaches, including bringing under restoration at least 35% of degraded ecosystems, [prioritising biodiversity benefits and] thereby contributing to climate change mitigation and adaptation and to combating desertification*

- *By 2030, the contribution of biodiversity to climate change mitigation, adaptation, ecosystem resilience and to combating desertification has been enhanced through ecosystem-based approaches, including bringing under restoration at least 35% of degraded ecosystems, prioritising biodiversity benefits*

Successor to Target 20:

- *Mobilise the financial resources necessary to halt the loss of species, ecosystems and genetic diversity by 2030, including as appropriate through overseas development assistance, mitigation of embodied impacts, philanthropy, non-grant instruments, and other sources, towards restoration and recovery by 2050*

Enabling conditions, implementation and accountability

Implementation: However good the framework, tackling the nature emergency depends on effective implementation. The framework should include implementation plans for all its elements, a monitoring and review process utilising existing indicators, and a mechanism for 'global stocktakes' to enable countries to 'ratchet up' (enhance ambition and implementation efforts). The contributions of all Parties and other stakeholders need to be clear and transparent.

Part of such transparency relates to the threats to biodiversity resulting from trade flows between countries. Incorporation of exported and imported impacts ("telecoupling") is needed.

Resource mobilization: A resource mobilisation strategy should be an integral part of the development and implementation of the new post-2020 global biodiversity framework. A combination of private and public finance will be essential to the achievement of global biodiversity targets, cost effective with a smart focus on resources deployment - to build sustainable economies that generate economic benefits while increasing biodiversity.

The resource mobilisation strategy should include a global call to the private and philanthropy sector to upscale, mobilize and leverage private investment - to generate economic benefits while increasing biodiversity. Maintaining and increasing public sector finance is essential; one immediate need is to ramp up biodiversity-related official development aid.

Financial mechanism (Global Environment Facility): The compilation of estimated funding and investment needs to be submitted by relevant Parties as referred to in CBD/WG2020/1/3 (IV c) will be essential for the determination of Parties' funding needs in anticipation of the eighth replenishment of the Trust Fund of the Global Environment Facility. IUCN welcomes the improvement in timeframe for accessing funds from GEF. An integrated approach towards biodiversity loss, land degradation and climate change should be a central theme throughout the post-2020 framework and supported by GEF.

Capacity building and human resources: the long-term overarching strategic framework for capacity building (for human and technical resources) beyond 2020 should be developed to address identified gaps and needs to cover capacity development at the individual, institutional and systemic levels; it should include a clear timeline.

Scientific cooperation and technology transfer: strengthening technical and scientific cooperation, technology transfer and innovation will be important to support the post-2020 global biodiversity framework. Mapping and assessment of technologies relevant to the needs of countries should support this.

Knowledge management: facilitation of simple and timely access to relevant information and knowledge to support planning, policy and decision-making processes, is essential. The clearing-house mechanism's design and further development needs to respond to its intended purpose. An assessment of its use could be useful.

Communication: Raising awareness of all stakeholders on the urgency of the crisis is essential – to help generate a public movement for nature, and commitments to science-based targets from individual actors, including at the IUCN World Conservation Congress (Marseille, France, June 2020). The production of an awareness raising strategy is urgent.

Planning and accountability

Transparency and accountability, including the importance of identifying means to ensure effective review of implementation of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework, are fundamental.

National biodiversity strategies and action plans:

NBSAPs should be the main vehicle for the implementation of the global biodiversity framework to deliver not only CBD but also the other two Rio Conventions and the biodiversity-related conventions. The framework also needs to fully align and contribute to the 2030 Sustainable Development Goals and targets. NBSAPs will therefore need to be re-formatted and updated to align with the new global framework. Updated NBSAPs could incorporate voluntary biodiversity commitments from non-State actors.

Targets should take into account the precise conditions and opportunities of each country (as reflected in, for example, the "Three Global Conditions for Biodiversity Conservation and Sustainable Use" developed by the IUCN World Commission on Protected Areas) and be additive across countries to provide clarity on progress made at any given time with respect the achievement of the 2030 Mission.

National reports: National reports could be enhanced to become the main vehicle for reporting on national implementation of the post-2020 framework (not just the CBD).

The national reporting processes of other relevant conventions and processes could be aligned to assist with this streamlining. Consistency of format will facilitate alignment with other reporting processes. A mechanism to enhance the reporting process, such as a Compliance Committee could be explored.

Review process: Monitoring efforts will need to be significantly scaled-up to assess whether national targets and contributions would 'add up' in terms of their impact, to yield the intent of the global target(s) when "combined with" voluntary contributions for biodiversity made by non-State actors. This is linked to the need for adaptive management, and the "ratcheting mechanism" mentioned above.

Cross-cutting approaches and issues:

Synergies: As stated, the post-2020 global biodiversity framework should be a unified action plan that aligns with the other two Rio Conventions, the biodiversity-related conventions and the 2030 Agenda.

Mainstreaming: NBSAPS should facilitate full internalization of biodiversity considerations in operations that undermine nature (mainstreaming). This is a critical prerequisite to achieving the change necessary throughout society and the economy, across all government departments, scales and sectors.

IUCN is exploring the development of targets for economic sectors that aim at facilitating their contribution to the implementation of the post-2020 framework, and enhance accountability.

A framework for all stakeholders

A truly global framework for biodiversity conservation is needed for all of society; it should engage countries, cities, sub-national governments, indigenous peoples and local communities, industry, women, youth, farmers, civil society and the private sector. It should be gender-responsive and reflect linkages between nature and culture, a crucial focus for achieving a World of Living in Harmony with Nature.

To facilitate such involvement, all elements of the framework should be scalable from global to local and able to be disaggregated into specific targets that allow any national government, sector or stakeholder to determine specific contributions towards global targets, and to reflect differentiated responsibilities. Implementation can be enhanced if the contribution of these actors, already taking on-the-ground action, is better recognized, encouraged and supported.

Indigenous peoples and local communities: The knowledge, innovations and practices of indigenous peoples and local communities (IPLCs) are an essential consideration for the structure of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework. This should include both ensuring representative decision-making and including content in the framework that advocates for wider application of traditional knowledge in conservation, with consent from, involvement of and equitable benefit sharing for knowledge holders.

Gender: Gender-responsive approaches to biodiversity conservation and recognition of women's rights, gender equality, social equity and good governance, should be embedded in the post-2020 global biodiversity framework. Gender considerations based on best practice should be fully mainstreamed in NBSAPs.

Youth: The post-2020 global biodiversity framework should include explicit provision for the involvement of youth, who need to be fully and meaningfully engaged in its development.