



Convention on Biological Diversity

Distr.
GENERAL

CBD/POST2020/PREP/1/INF/2
23 May 2019

ENGLISH ONLY

PREPARATIONS FOR THE POST-2020 GLOBAL BIODIVERSITY FRAMEWORK

SECOND SYNTHESIS OF VIEWS OF PARTIES AND OBSERVERS ON THE SCOPE AND CONTENT OF THE POST-2020 GLOBAL BIODIVERSITY FRAMEWORK

Note by the Executive Secretary

I. BACKGROUND

1. In decision [14/34](#), the Conference of the Parties to the Convention on Biological Diversity adopted a comprehensive and participatory process for the preparation of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework. The process required that an initial discussion document summarizing and analysing the initial views of Parties and observers be made available in January 2019. Accordingly, a discussion document¹ and supporting information document² were developed. Through a notification³ Parties to the Convention and its Protocols, indigenous peoples and local communities and relevant organizations were invited to provide further views on the post-2020 global biodiversity framework.⁴ A total of 74 submissions were received, of which 21 were from Parties, including one from the European Union and its member States. Some Parties and observers submitted more than once, and some submissions were on behalf of multiple stakeholders.

¹ [CBD/POST2020/PREP/1/1](#)

² [CBD/POST2020/PREP/1/INF/1](#)

³ [2019-008](#)

⁴ By 24 May 2019, submissions were received from Argentina, Brazil, Canada, Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, the European Union and its member states, India, Japan, Mexico, New Zealand, Norway, Oman, Republic of Korea, South Africa, Switzerland, Turkmenistan, Uganda, United States of America, Advisory Committee on Subnational Governments and Biodiversity, African Parks Network Biodiversity Research Program, BirdLife International, Born Free Foundation, CAF, CaMPAM, CBD Alliance, Center for Large Landscape Conservation (CLLC), CITES Secretariat Conservation Finance Alliance, Consorcio de Gobiernos Provinciales del Ecuador, EcoHealth Alliance and the Future Earth oneHEALTH Global Research Project, EcoNexus, Environment and Conservation Organisations of New Zealand, Environmental Protection Information Center (EPIC), FIAN International, FLEDGE, Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations, Forest Peoples Programme, Frankfurt Zoological Society, Friends of the Earth, the Global Forest Coalition Global Wildlife Conservation, GPPC, Greenpeace International, Group on Earth Observations Biodiversity Observation Network (GEO BON), GRULAC Non-Governmental Organizations (Buenos Aires meeting), Healthy Urban Microbiome Initiative, ICLEI, International Fund for Animal Welfare (IFAW), International Coral Reef Initiative, International Institute for Environment and Development, IUCN, Japan Youth Biodiversity Network, MedPan, MedPAN network, National Geographic Society, Natural Justice, NatureServe, NOAA, OECD, PBL Netherlands Environmental Assessment Agency, Population Matters, PROMPERU, Specially Protected Areas Regional Activity Centre (SPA/RAC), Te Ohu Kaimoana (the Māori Fisheries Trust), The International Barcode of Life Consortium, The Nature Conservancy, Third World Network, TRAFFIC, UEBT, UN Women, UNCTAD BioTrade, UNEP, UNEP-WCMC, United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization, United Nations Environmental-Economic Accounts Section, United Nations University Institute for the Advanced Study of Sustainability (UNU-IAS), Wild Heritage, Wildlife Conservation Society, Working Group on Agricultural Biodiversity of the International Planning Committee for Food Sovereignty, WWF International, WWF-Germany, and WWF-United Kingdom. All of the submissions received are accessible from <https://www.cbd.int/conferences/post2020/submissions>

2. The present document has been prepared, with the guidance of the Co-Chairs of the Open-ended Working Group on the Post-2020 Global Biodiversity Framework, to support the ongoing consultation process. This document synthesizes the views submitted in response to the notification noted above. It follows a similar structure to the discussion document noted above. This synthesis does not replace earlier documentation or the submissions on this issue but complements them. It is not intended to be limiting or to prejudice the outcomes of the process for developing the post-2020 global biodiversity framework but, rather, to facilitate discussion.

II. SYNTHESIS OF ISSUES RAISED

3. Parties and observers have expressed a range of views on the possible scope and content of a post-2020 global biodiversity framework. These include views on (a) the ambition level for the post-2020 global biodiversity framework; (b) the relationship between the post-2020 global biodiversity framework, the current Strategic Plan and other relevant processes; (c) the relationship between the Convention and its Protocols; (d) the elements of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework, including: (i) the conceptual framework; (ii) the 2050 Vision for Biodiversity; (iii) its mission; (iv) its strategic goals; (v) biodiversity targets; (vi) tools and mechanisms for implementation; (vii) review processes; and (viii) indicators; (e) participation; (f) mainstreaming and synergies; (g) communication and outreach; and (h) gaps in the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020 that could be addressed in the post-2020 global biodiversity framework. The views expressed are synthesized below, organized according to these headings.

4. Many of the submissions addressed the questions raised in the discussion document issued on 31 January 2019. However, many responses were cross-cutting and addressed multiple issues. As such the responses received were, in many cases relevant to multiple questions. The cross-cutting nature of some comments may not be reflected in the document in order to keep it to a manageable size. Further, many of the submissions raised distinct issues and while these are presented as such in the present document, it is important to note that these issues are not necessarily in opposition to one another.

A. Structure of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework

5. Many earlier submissions suggested that a structure or approach is needed to link the different elements of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework and to highlight the linkages between its different elements. Some of the suggested approaches have been a pyramid or tiered structure, while others have suggested structures similar to the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development and the current Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020. In the most recent submissions similar suggestions have been made.

6. Many submissions have noted the need to build from and/or ensure consistency with the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020 and/or the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development. Some have also noted the need for consistency with other international agreements, such as those adopted under the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate change (UNFCCC) and the United Nations Convention to Combat Desertification (UNCCD). The need for short-, medium- and long-term elements in the post-2020 global biodiversity framework was noted as being important in reaching the 2050 Vision. It was also observed that the structure of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework needs to address the three objectives of the Convention and that the future framework should cover a 10-year period. However, one submission suggested that it should cover the period from 2021 to 2035.

7. Many submissions commented on the possible elements of the post-2020 Global Biodiversity Framework (some of these are discussed in further detail in other sections of this note). Elements frequently identified in the submissions were:

2050 Vision – As per decision 14/34, many submissions noted that the 2050 Vision remains relevant and should be reflected in the post-2020 global biodiversity framework. Some noted that long-term goals or milestones may be needed to more concretely reflect the 2050 Vision in the future framework. More details on this issue are in section C;

Mission – As per decision 14/34, many submissions noted general support for the post-2020 global biodiversity framework having a mission statement. Some suggested that the mission statement could also take the form of an “apex” target. More details on this issue are in section D;

High-level goals or targets – Many submissions noted that the post-2020 global biodiversity framework should have a set of strategic or high-level goals or targets. Some suggested that the strategic goals in the current Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020 could be used or further developed in the future framework. Many of the submissions suggested that on the order of five strategic goals or targets would be desirable.⁵ It was also suggested that there could be types of goals or targets in the post-2020 framework, including “outcome goals” and “output goals”. Others pointed to the benefits of framing goals and targets according to the driver pressure state impact response (DPSIR) model. The need for longer-term targets or goals was also noted. (This issue is further discussed in section E);

Targets – Some submissions suggest that the Aichi Targets should serve as a basis for the targets in the post-2020 global biodiversity framework. Some suggested that the maximum number of targets should be 20 and that the use of sub-targets should be considered to simplify the framework and/or to reduce the total number of targets. The possibility of having targets, including longer-term targets, serving as milestones towards the 2050 Vision was also noted. The potential scope and content of targets is discussed in section E;

Indicators – The need for indicators was noted in many submissions. Indicators are further discussed in section J;

Enabling elements – The need for actions, targets or elements to support the implementation of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework was noted in some submissions. Some suggested that these could be stand-alone targets while other suggested that they be more cross-cutting or a distinct element of the framework. Issues that were frequently mentioned as being enabling elements were resource mobilization, technology transfer and capacity-building (see section L), mainstreaming (see section H) and promoting participation (see section P), among others;

Review mechanism – Many submissions identified that an enhanced review mechanism is needed to be able to more efficiently and periodically monitor implementation. Some submissions suggested that this mechanism should be reflected in the structure of the post-2020 framework. Review mechanisms are further discussed in section N.

8. In developing these various elements of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework, several submissions noted the importance of working backwards from the 2050 Vision to identify the scope of the actions which are needed (“backcasting approaches”). Such an approach was noted as being particularly relevant in the development of the mission, goals and targets of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework (this issue is further discussed in section C. Many submissions also suggested options for conceptual frameworks to link the different elements of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework. These include:

(a) A structure similar to the Sustainable Development Goals;

A structure similar to the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020;

A pyramid structure with layers of objectives, actions and enabling conditions in support of a central objective or apex target.

⁵ Some of the suggested themes or issues to address through strategic goals or targets were: To address the underlying causes of biodiversity loss, reducing the direct pressures on biodiversity and promote the use of natural resources, to improve the status of biodiversity by safeguarding ecosystems, species and genetic diversity, increase the benefits provided by biodiversity and ecosystem services to societies and economies, improve implementation through participatory planning, management of resources, resource mobilization and capacity building. Another suggestion was that the goals should be related to ecosystem services.

9. Similarly, some submissions suggested variations or combinations of these different approaches. For example, it was suggested that combination of the pyramid approach and nested approach where different types of targets and elements are grouped to illustrate their interdependencies. It was also suggested that different types of conceptual frameworks could be developed for different audiences.

10. Some submissions suggested that the conceptual framework for the post-2020 global biodiversity framework could be complimented by ancillary frameworks or plans of action. In this light, some submissions referred to the Global Strategy for Plan Conservation, the Gender Plan of Action, the Strategy for Resource Mobilization and the Convention's strategy on communication, education and public awareness.

11. Several submissions provided general comments on what the purpose of the structure for the post-2020 global biodiversity framework should be. Submissions noted that the structure should be simple, reflect and communicate a logical arrangement of the framework's elements and serve as a theory of change model and/or set out a pathway to reaching the 2050 Vision. It was also suggested that some of the structures "higher level" elements could be endorsed or recognized by the biodiversity-related conventions, international organizations and possibly the United Nations General Assembly.

12. Some submissions suggested that the structure for the post-2020 global biodiversity framework should also communicate the state of nature and nature's contributions to people and clarify the inter-related relationships between the state of nature, direct and indirect drivers and pressures of biodiversity loss, actions, and enabling conditions for action. Others noted that the structure should present a holistic approach to biodiversity management, be action oriented, and promote the involvement of all stakeholders and all relevant sectors. Some felt that the structure should take the form of a results-based framework and specify the expected outputs, impacts and outcomes of the post-2020 framework as well as promote inter-cultural and multi-lateral dialogue and cooperation. Several submissions also noted the importance of developing a theory of change or narrative for the conceptual framework of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework in order to illustrate how its different elements relate to each other.

13. Some submissions also noted that there were several possible structures for the post-2020 global biodiversity framework, each with different strengths and challenges and that no single structure is likely to capture all the different dynamics involved. For this reason, it was suggested that the structure for the post-2020 global biodiversity framework should be general enough so that it could be tailored to different audiences and/or to different national circumstances.

Summary

14. Overall there appears to be general support for a structure for the post-2020 global biodiversity framework which is composed of the 2050 Vision, a mission statement for 2030, a set of associated goals and targets (with possible sub-targets), indicators, enabling elements and a review mechanism. There have been three main proposals for how these elements could be structured, using the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020 as a model, using the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development as a model or developing a "pyramid" type structure.

B. Ambition of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework

15. A general view expressed in earlier submissions was that the post-2020 global biodiversity framework should be ambitious and support the transformational changes needed to realize the 2050 Vision for Biodiversity. It was also suggested that the post-2020 global biodiversity framework should serve as a universal framework for action on biodiversity and foster strong ownership and support for its implementation. In the most recent round of submissions many contributors further articulated what would constitute an ambitious post-2020 global biodiversity framework, how ambition could be achieved and the need to appropriately balance ambition and realism.

1. What is meant by ambition?

16. Different perspectives on what would constitute an ambitious post-2020 process were expressed. A general theme in several submissions was the need for transformation or structural changes in how biodiversity is perceived and valued by society and which keep pressures on biodiversity at or below the limits of sustainability or “planetary limits”. Others referred to “bending the curve” of biodiversity loss. With regard to transformative change, some submissions refer to recent work undertaken by the Intergovernmental Science-Policy Platform on Biodiversity and Ecosystem Services (IPBES) as providing the basis for this and noted that the definition used by IPBES, “A fundamental, system-wide reorganization across technological, economic and social factors, including paradigms, goals and values” could be used. Similarly, the need to move beyond incremental change was noted. Relatedly some felt that an ambitious framework would be one that recognizes that sustainable development will require changes to value systems and institutions, incentivizes action, and is effective and accountable. It was also suggested that ambition could be interpreted as supporting socio-ecological transitions for sustainability.

17. Some submissions felt that an ambitious post-2020 global biodiversity framework would be one which strengthens multilateralism, strengthens environmental governance, enhances the efficiency of policy processes, emphasizes national obligations under the Convention and which addresses the three objectives of the Convention. An ambitious framework was also understood to mean one which galvanizes global level actions for biodiversity, which engages broad participation in its implementation and helps to build partnerships, including with the private sector, for this purpose. It was also understood to mean one which generates a societal sense of responsibility to act for biodiversity at the local, regional, national and international levels and among all actors. Some suggested that for the post-2020 global biodiversity framework to be ambitious it needs to raise the political relevance of biodiversity at the highest levels, including through its consideration at a heads of State summit, so that it is viewed as more than a list of intentions but rather as a set of concrete commitments for living in harmony with nature.

18. The need for a greater focus on sustainable consumption and production and a re-examination or broader understanding of what development is was also suggested. The need for some to reduce their consumption while the need for others to increase it (a move towards “contraction and convergence”) was noted. Some noted that ambition would require rights-based approaches to recognize, protect, and ensure equal rights and access to biodiversity, ecosystem services, and relevant support mechanisms for biodiversity conservation would be needed. Other suggested the need for more explicit recognition of the connections between nature and culture. An ambitious framework was also suggested to be one which sets out precise outcomes for the conservation and recovery of biodiversity and the restoration of ecosystems as well as reflects the necessary scope, content and scale of actions needed to halt biodiversity loss, to shift land-use practices to sustainability and to ensure long-term provision of all ecosystem services for the benefit of people on the planet.

19. Some submissions related the level of ambition of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework to the level of ambition of other processes. For example, some felt that the post-2020 Global Biodiversity Framework should be more ambitious than the current Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020. Others felt that an ambitious post-2020 framework would be one which allows the 2050 Vision for Biodiversity to be met. Some felt that the post-2020 framework should be supportive and complimentary to 2030 the Agenda for Sustainable Development or the plans adopted by other multilateral environmental agreements. However, one submission also expressed the view that the post-2020 framework should be more ambitious than these processes. It was also suggested that the level of progress towards the Aichi Biodiversity Targets could be used as a baseline for determining the level of ambition for the post-2020 global biodiversity framework.

2. Possible means to promote ambition

20. Many submissions contained suggestions on how an ambitious post-2020 global biodiversity framework could be established and/or what its characteristics would be. Generally, it was suggested that ambition could be increased by ensuring that the post-2020 global biodiversity framework is concrete,

aspirational, and clearly articulates the required actions, priority issues and the constituencies of change. It was also suggested that for targets where terms are undefined, definitions should be developed in collaboration with other relevant actors to ensure a common understanding of shared objectives. The adoption of high level or “iconic” global target(s) to help galvanize action and awareness was also noted. The elements of the post-2020 framework should also be developed based on the best available evidence, including scientific and traditional knowledge.

21. Several submissions suggested that a “back-casting” approach, working backwards from 2050 to see what goals and targets need to be set in 2020, should be used to ensure that the post-2020 global biodiversity framework is ambitious enough to bring about the needed outcomes. Similarly, it was suggested that the post-2020 global biodiversity framework should clearly articulate milestones for 2030 (this issue is further discussed in section C) and that the plan needs to be based on an understanding of what “dangerous” biodiversity loss might mean.

22. Many submissions noted that for the post-2020 global biodiversity framework to be ambitious it will be necessary to ensure that sufficient means of implementation are available, including funding and tools. In this respect it was observed that while the Global Environmental Facility will continue to have an important role additional funding sources need to be identified. The possibility of developing global and regional funds, like the Green Climate Fund, was noted as was the potential role of public private partnerships. The possibility of identifying funding needs and commitments for each biodiversity target was also suggested as a possible approach (issues related to resource mobilization and the Global Environment Facility are further discussed in sections L and M).

23. Submissions also noted that a more ambitious post-2020 framework would require better means of tracking progress in implementation. Some of the issues raised to address this were more standardized and frequent reporting, including by making use of the online reporting tool for the sixth national reports, the greater use of indicators, more guidance on the development and revision of national biodiversity strategies and action plans (Issues related to review processes and mechanisms are further discussed in section N). Other submissions noted the need for national ownership and integration of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework into national policies.

24. The need for more integrated approaches to implementation was also identified as a way of supporting an ambitious post-2020 global biodiversity framework. The development of integrated approaches to mainstreaming biodiversity, including in the into agriculture, forestry, fisheries, aquaculture, tourism, energy and mining, infrastructure, manufacturing and processing sectors, at national, regional and international levels as well as the promotion of innovative solutions for this were noted in this respect (The issue of mainstreaming is further discussed in section H).

25. The need to further develop to the programmes of work under the Convention as well as to developed thematic programmes on issues such as pollution, pollinators, urbanization and the integration of biodiversity in the productive and social sectors were also identified as means or contributing to the implementation of an ambitious post-2020 framework.

26. Various approaches and tools were also suggested as means of promoting ambition. These included the greater use of the System of Environmental Economic Accounting (SEEA), the development and use of innovative financing and conservation strategies and the use of multilevel governance systems. More generally, the urgent need to implement existing CBD obligations was noted as a means of ensuring that the post-2020 global biodiversity framework was ambitious.

3. *Balancing ambition and realism*

27. Several submissions also commented on the need to balance ambition and realism in the post-2020 global biodiversity framework. It was noted that the scope and content of the post-2020 framework needs to be sufficient enough to bring about the action needed to have a world living in harmony with biodiversity by 2050 and to promote transformational change but not excessively ambitious so that it becomes unrealistic and discourages implementation. In this respect some also cautioned against making

the scope of the post-2020 global biodiversity too broad and that the framework must respect biophysical realities.

4. *Summary*

28. Overall, there is general support for an ambitious post-2020 global biodiversity framework which places the global community on a path to reach the 2050 Vision for Biodiversity. There are various interpretations of what this ambition should look like. However, some common general elements appear to be the need for all actors to be involved in implementation, a greater recognition of biodiversity as linked to sustainable development and human well-being, a greater attention to issues related to sustainable consumption and production. Various approaches to bringing about an ambitious post-2020 framework were also noted. Generally, these involved ensuring that the post-2020 global biodiversity framework was clearly articulated, based on sound evidence and an understanding of where we want to be in 2050. The need to ensure high-level political ownership and broader societal engagement in implementation was also common across many submissions. Many of the submissions also explicitly or implicitly indicated that the degree to which the post-2020 global biodiversity framework will be ambitious will depend on how issues associated with review mechanisms, resource mobilization and mainstreaming will be addressed. While the need for ambition was recognized in most submissions the need to avoid being overly ambitious was also noted.

C. **2050 Vision for biodiversity**

29. Decision 14/2 sets out that the 2050 Vision “Living in harmony with nature” remains relevant and should be considered in the post-2020 global biodiversity framework. Further many earlier submissions also indicated that the rationale for the 2050 Vision should be further developed and that a common and clear understanding of what reaching the 2050 Vision for Biodiversity entails in concrete terms needs to be developed. Many of the more recent submissions continued to explore this issue.

1. *What does the 2050 Vision for Biodiversity mean?*

30. Many submissions present different interpretations of the 2050 Vision. Some suggested that it could be interpreted as reaching the three objectives of the Convention. However, some felt that it was much broader than this. Some suggested that it could be related to concepts such as “No Net Loss,” “Planetary Boundaries”, “Ecological Footprint”, the “Green Economy” and the “Global Deal for Nature”. It was also suggested that the 2050 Vision could be linked to the concept of resilience as well as to ensuring a balance between people and the environment. Some of the issues raised in relation to this were the need to reflect biodiversity values in planning, development, policy and decision-making processes across government and society, the need to conserve, restore and sustainably use biodiversity through effective conservation/restoration programmes and measures, and having 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.

31. Some submissions suggested that the Vision referred to certain biological conditions. For example, it was suggested that the Vision could be interpreted as ensuring that the earth’s bio-geophysical systems are healthy and functional, protecting the functions and roles of ecosystems, ensuring resilient ecosystems and promoting the conservation and restoration of biodiversity. Others suggested that the Vision could be interpreted as ensuring that the direct and indirect pressures on biodiversity are addressed and halting biodiversity loss and improving the survival probability of all species. Alternatively, it was suggested that it could refer to a recognition of the direct and indirect contribution of biodiversity to food security and nutrition, sustainable livelihoods and poverty eradication.

32. Submissions also suggested that the Vision is related to ensuring a greater engagement of government and people in biodiversity issues and that it requires a radical change in human behaviour by 2050. Similarly, it was also suggested that it entails recognition that biodiversity is the ultimate source of human well-being and welfare and that biodiversity has intrinsic values. Some suggested that the Vision implies creating the enabling conditions for people to take actions to live in harmony with nature while

others noted that the second part of the Vision statement (“by 2050, biodiversity is valued, conserved, restored and wisely used, maintaining ecosystem services, sustaining a healthy planet, and delivering benefits essential for all people”) provides the specificity on what the Vision entails.

33. The need to link the 2050 Vision to development, the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development, and other multilateral environmental agreements was also noted. Using the concept of “nature’s contributions to people” was also noted as being potentially relevant. Several submissions also suggested that “people” should be more strongly reflected or considered in the 2050 Vision for Biodiversity and that the Vision entails the need for social justice, human-rights and gender responsive approaches to conservation and sustainable use. Others noted that the Vision entails finding equilibrium between human needs and sustainability, recognizing and respecting the interdependence of humans and ecological systems and considering the needs of future generations.

34. Some submissions noted that defining the 2050 Vision in concrete terms would be difficult as it is likely to mean different things to different groups. In this respect, some submissions suggested that Governments should develop their own interpretation of the 2050 Vision and reflect it in relevant policy documents, such as their national biodiversity strategies and action plans. Others suggested that the Vision is oversimplistic and does not address complexity of competing societal interests. Following from this it was suggested that the conceptual framework developed by IPBES could serve as an example in addressing different perspectives of living in harmony with biodiversity.

2. What are the implications of the 2050 Vision for Biodiversity?

35. In addition to providing information on potential interpretations of the 2050 Vision, many submissions also addressed potential implications resulting from it. It was noted that pathways to reach the 2050 Vision need to be identified and that means of linking or connecting future biodiversity targets with the 2050 Vision need to be explored to clearly map out how to get there. Similarly, it was noted that though the Vision has a deadline of 2050, this should not be interpreted as being able to defer urgent action until then. In this respect, it was suggested that targets for the next ten years could serve as milestones towards the 2050 Vision and focus on urgent issues which need to be addressed as a matter of priority. It was also suggested that reaching the 2050 Vision, based on the results of the IPBES global assessment, would entail addressing changes in land and sea use, the direct exploitation of organisms, climate change, pollution and invasive alien species.

36. It was also observed that many different types of actions will be needed to reach the 2050 Vision and that decisions previously made by the Conference of the Parties, for example through decision 14/2, could provide guidance for these. Similarly, some also noted that the text of the Convention and the Rio Declaration on Environment and Development also provide guidance of the actions needed to reach the 2050 Vision. Further, some noted that the main elements contained in the 2050 Vision (valuing biodiversity, conserving biodiversity, restoring biodiversity and sustainably using biodiversity in a balanced manner) already specify the implications. It was also suggested that the measures identified in the IPBES global assessment, namely changing and reducing consumption and waste, expanding and strengthening existing networks of protected areas, establishing integrated governance models at the landscape level, promoting sustainable food systems from the point of view of production and consumption, maintaining freshwater in a context of climate change, and local action, could provide a starting point for reaching the 2050 Vision.

37. Some of the more specific action that may be needed identified in the submissions were:

- (a) Addressing gaps to meet all three objectives of the Convention;
- (b) Improving synergies with other processes;
- (c) Raising society’s awareness of biodiversity values, the implications of its loss and the actions that can be taken;
- (d) Strengthening accountability;

- (e) Strengthening biodiversity mainstreaming by incorporating biodiversity values in national planning and development processes, sectors, policy and decision-making;
- (f) Mobilization of financial resources;
- (g) Addressing the drivers of biodiversity loss comprehensively and equitably;
- (h) Addressing the links between biodiversity and health;
- (i) Adopting holistic and integrated approaches and actions that lead to the long-term protection and integrity of the Earth system;
- (j) Translating and adapting the Vision, according to national circumstances, and incorporating it into national biodiversity strategies and action plans;
- (k) More research on the desired future state of nature;
- (l) Enhancing the global network of protected areas;
- (m) Interventions to recover populations of all threatened species.

3. *Summary*

38. The majority of submissions noted the continued relevance of the 2050 Vision for Biodiversity and various interpretations of its meaning were suggested. Generally, there appears to be agreement that the 2050 Vision represents a transformation in society's relationship with biodiversity and that this transformation will require a whole of society engagement. Further there appears to be general agreement that reaching the 2050 Vision will require that urgent actions are taken and that the post-2020 global biodiversity framework needs to place society on a path towards the 2050 Vision. It was also noted that pathways to reach the 2050 Vision need to be identified and that means of linking or connecting the other elements of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework to it need to be explored to clearly map out how to reach it. Many of the submissions also suggested that there is need to give greater attention to issues related to sustainable use and the interconnections between biodiversity and human well-being.

D. Mission

39. Decision 14/34 specifies that the post-2020 global biodiversity framework should be accompanied by an inspirational and motivating 2030 mission as a stepping stone towards the 2050 Vision "Living in harmony with nature", and that it should be supported by a coherent, comprehensive and innovative communication strategy. The need for a clear definition of what the mission statement means in practice was noted in many earlier submissions and different suggestions for its formulation have been suggested. In the more recent submissions some specific proposals for a mission statement were provide as was more general information on issues that should be considered when developing it.

1. General characteristics of the mission

40. Many submissions suggested that the mission statement should be ambitious, actionable, forward looking, evidence based and inspiring, but also succinct, easy to communicate and relevant to different audiences. Some also felt that the mission statement should convey the overall objective of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework as well as encapsulate the importance of biodiversity for human society. Others felt that it should have a clear focus on biodiversity conservation and sustainable use and described the achievements needed for 2030. Relatedly some felt that the mission statement should address what is needed by 2030 as well as what is needed to promote and facilitate action. It was also suggested that the mission could take the form of an overarching objective, acting as a clear and measurable milestone on the path to the 2050 Vision against which Parties could set corresponding headline objectives at national level.

41. Some suggested that the mission statement of the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020 remains relevant but should be simplified to be made more relevant and to focus on issues directly under the purview of the Convention. Others suggested that it should address all aspects of the Convention and

its Protocols. Alternatively, some suggested that that mission statement should take the form of a planetary science-based target for biodiversity, similar to the 2°C/1.5°C target agreed under UNFCCC. It was also noted that the mission statement could be expressed as an “apex” target for the entire post-2020 global biodiversity framework. However, some submissions cautioned against an apex target as it would be difficult or problematic to address the complexity of biodiversity issues under a single parameter or target.

42. Several submissions also connected the formulation of the mission statement to the 2050 Vision. Some suggested that the mission statement could take the form a “disaggregated” 2050 Vision for Biodiversity. Others suggested that the mission should link to the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development. Others suggested that the mission statement should be framed as a milestone towards 2050. One suggestion for this was to focus on reducing the loss of biodiversity, and its restoration, recovery and retention or linked to the concepts of “bending the curve” or “no more net loss”.

2. *Possible elements of a mission for the post-2020 global biodiversity framework*

43. In addition to these general views, several possible elements for the mission statement were proposed. Some suggested that the mission statement should have a focus on mainstreaming given the importance that this issue has been given by the two previous meetings of the Conference of the Parties. It has been suggested that this should take the form of a commitment to achieve a transformative change in the current unsustainable consumption trajectory which has contributed to biodiversity loss. More specifically, it has been suggested that the mission statement could address issues related to:

- (a) The assessment of biodiversity;
- (b) Addressing the causes of biodiversity loss;
- (c) Mobilizing action for biodiversity;
- (d) Communicating and education for the sustainable management of biodiversity;
- (e) Encouraging conservation and sustainable use;
- (f) Implementing actions to halt biodiversity loss and to restore biodiversity by various stakeholders;
- (g) Making contribution to the achievement of the Sustainable Development Goal;
- (h) The need for transformational changes;
- (i) The need to strengthen alliances between different actors and sectors;
- (j) Highlighting the importance of means of implementation;
- (k) The well-being of people and the protection of nature.

44. Specific suggestions for the formulation of the mission statement were:

- (a) Integrate biodiversity into all sectors of society to maintain services and to enhance in an inclusive way its benefits for society, the quality of life of its people, and achieve the sustainable use of biodiversity in the productive sectors;
- (b) By 2030, halt the loss of biodiversity and put nature on a path to recovery for the benefit of all people and the planet;
- (c) By 2030, halt the loss of biodiversity and put nature on a path to recovery for the benefit of climate and people;
- (d) By 2030, all essential components of nature are identified and effectively conserved or managed to ensure their contribution to the long-term integrity of the biosphere and the services needed for humanity;

- (e) Reverse the loss of biodiversity by 2030 and put nature on a path to recovery for the benefit of people and the planet;
- (f) Ensure that biodiversity loss is halted, biological resources are sustainably used and benefits arising out of utilization of genetic resources are shared in a fair and equitable manner;
- (g) Ensure the diversity of life on Earth by working jointly with the Rio conventions and other biodiversity conventions;
- (h) Implement all actions necessary and sufficient to halt the loss of species, ecosystems, and genetic diversity, as essential for achievement of the 2050 Vision and sustainable development;
- (i) Safeguarding half of the Earth in its natural state, with integral, functioning, and connected ecosystems that continue to provide for humanity and the rest of life on the planet;
- (j) Put nature on a path to recovery by 2030 for the benefit of people and the planet by halting biodiversity loss and reversing declines;
- (k) At least 30 percent of terrestrial and inland water areas and 30 percent of oceans to be safeguarded through effectively and equitably managed, ecologically representative, well-connected systems of highly protected areas and Other Effective Area Based Conservation Measures by 2030;
- (l) Working with civil society, the private sector, governments and international agencies to reduce biodiversity loss, through fair/equitable approaches to conservation and sustainable use, to no more than X per cent above natural background rates.

3. *Summary*

45. The submissions were generally consistent in their view that the mission of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework should cover the period between 2020 and 2030 and that it should serve as form of “milestone” for the 2050 Vision. However, it was also noted that the mission statement needs to complement the 2050 Vision by setting out the actions which need to be taken to reach it. Most submissions noted the importance of the mission statement in communicating the overall direction of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework and in this respect noted that it should be simple, easy to communicate and actionable. Some suggested that the mission could take the form of a high level or apex target while others suggested broader or more overarching formulations. From the submissions there also appear to be different interpretations of the mission statements possible formulation and purpose.

E. Biodiversity goals and targets

46. In earlier submissions there was wide support for the post-2020 global biodiversity framework having a set of science- and knowledge-based “SMART” (specific, measurable, ambitious, realistic and time-bound) biodiversity targets for the period from 2021 to 2030. Several of the submissions noted that the Aichi Biodiversity Targets should be used as the basis for developing any new targets and that changes to these should be kept to a minimum. Alternatively, it was suggested that some “modernization” of the Aichi Targets might be required. Further, many submissions suggested possible new targets. Many similar issues were raised in the most recent submissions on this issue.

1. General characteristics of goals and targets

47. Many submissions noted the need for quantifiable targets which are precise, concise, specific, based in science and/or evidence based and simple to communicate. Others noted the need for targets which are pragmatic, easy to measure and could be applicable, scalable or disaggregated to the regional, national or subnational level in order to galvanize action for implementation. Many submissions referred to the “SMART” criteria. It was suggested once targets have been developed they should be assessed to make sure they meet these criteria. However, some submissions also noted that defining “SMART” targets for some biodiversity issues would be challenging and may not be possible. Similarly, while there was a general preference for targets which are quantitative, it was also noted that for many issues it would not be conceptually or scientifically appropriate to define global-scale quantitative targets that could be

meaningfully translated to the diversity of national circumstances. However, it was suggested that it would be essential for all targets to be measurable. In this light the importance of working with indicator developers and providers was noted in order to avoid developing targets whose progress cannot be measured.

48. As noted above, many of the submissions suggested that the targets in the post-2020 global biodiversity framework should be ambitious. In this light, some submissions noted the need for “stretch” targets. However, it was also noted that targets need to realistic.

49. There appears to be general support for targets which cover the time period to 2030. However, the need for medium term targets (2040) and longer-term targets (2050) was also noted. It was suggested these longer-term targets could help to provide guidance for the attainment of the 2050 Vision. Further several submissions suggested that sub-targets could be developed to further operationalize the Aichi Targets and/or future biodiversity targets. However, some submissions also suggested that the overall number of targets should be kept low and not exceed the number of Aichi Biodiversity Targets. In this light, some cautioned against creating a large administrative burden on governments in terms of reporting.

50. Generally, submissions were either suggesting that targets should be focusing predominately on biodiversity outcomes or that a broader approach was needed. Relatedly, some submissions commented on the different possible types of targets in the post-2020 global biodiversity framework. Some types of targets noted were targets related to objectives, outcomes, outputs, processes, actions and enabling conditions. Further several submissions suggested that future targets should find a balance in addressing issues related to the pressures on biodiversity, its state and responses to its loss. Relatedly, some suggested that targets should identify the responsible actors.

51. The need to have a clear understanding of the relationship between the targets and the ambition set out in the 2050 Vision for Biodiversity and to the mission of the framework was noted. Similarly, some noted the importance of each target having a clear analytical rationale to illustrate how it supports the attainment of the mission and vision for the post-2020 global biodiversity framework. It was also suggested that enabling conditions for the targets could be developed and that these would facilitate implementation. It was also suggested that targets related to similar issues, for example agriculture, could be categorized under general headings to facilitate their identification by relevant actors.

2. *Basis for new targets*

52. Many of the submissions emphasized that the starting point for targets should be those in the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020. Some submissions noted that the themes addressed by the Aichi Biodiversity Target remain valid and that a radical departure from these would not facilitate implementation. Having targets with similar themes to the Aichi Biodiversity Targets would also enable the progress made to date to be built on. Similarly, some suggested that some of the Aichi Targets could be maintained in the future framework but updated. However, it was also suggested that new targets would be needed to address biosafety as well as new and emerging issues under the Convention. Further, there was one suggestion that those targets under Strategic Goals A and E of the current strategic plan be eliminated or consolidated.

53. Many submissions suggest that progress towards the Aichi Biodiversity Targets should be assessed and that this assessment should be used to inform the discussion on future targets. Some suggested that future targets should be based on those Aichi Biodiversity Targets for which the least progress has been made while those targets which have been reached could be revised to make them more ambitious. Similarly, some submissions suggested that the progress towards the current Aichi Targets could be used as a baseline to assess the progress in implementing the post-2020 global biodiversity framework. Such assessments could also be informed by recent work by IPBES and the fifth edition of the *Global Biodiversity Outlook*.

3. *Alignment to other processes*

54. Many submissions suggested that future biodiversity targets should be aligned with or supportive of the targets or strategies adopted by other relevant processes, including those associated with the Rio conventions and the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development. It was also suggested that they could be based on multinational agreements and approaches, such as the New York Declaration on Forests, the 10-Year Framework of Programmes on Sustainable Consumption and Production, the Sendai Framework for Disaster Risk Reduction 2015-2030, the United Nations Decade on Ecosystem Restoration 2021-2030, the Plan for Biodiversity of the Commission on Genetic Resources for Food and Agriculture and the International Treaty on Plant Genetic Resources for Food and Agriculture. It was also suggested that the post-2020 global biodiversity framework should be linked with conventions related to human rights and culture. It was suggested that this alignment could be done using sub-targets or sub-elements relevant to these different processes and linked to specific biodiversity targets. However, it was also suggested that while the targets of these various processes should not contradict each other, they do not need to match exactly. More generally some submissions noted the need to create synergy, support mainstreaming and facilitate reporting through an alignment of various processes but also pointed to the need to avoid duplication. It was also suggested that the post-2020 global biodiversity frameworks should be the main international instrument for biodiversity and also cautioned against losing focus on the main objectives of the Convention.

55. With regard to the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development, it was noted that some of the targets related to biodiversity adopted under the 2030 Agenda are based on the Aichi Biodiversity Targets and have an end date of 2020. Given this, it was noted that it will be important to ensure that these targets be updated to reflect what is adopted as part of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework. Others suggested that the post-2020 global biodiversity framework should also articulate how biodiversity contributed to the “non-biodiversity” related targets in the 2030 Agenda.

56. While most submissions suggested that the post-2020 global biodiversity framework should be aligned with other processes, some comments noted the potential of the framework to encourage other relevant organizations to adopt or set their own targets in support of the implementation of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework. For example, some submissions referred to the potential role of the Global Partnership for Plant Conservation in updating both the existing Global Strategy for Plant Conservation targets (2010-2020) and in linking them to the post-2020 global biodiversity framework. More generally it was suggested that the post-2020 global biodiversity framework should facilitate and encourage the development of thematic, regional or sectoral targets and processes that can contribute to any post-2020 targets adopted. Similarly, it was suggested that other multilateral environmental agreements (MEAs) and relevant sectoral organizations could be invited to contribute to the development and implementation of specific targets related to their respective policies.

4. *Specific suggestions for the formulation of targets*

57. As noted above, many submissions suggested that the Aichi Biodiversity Targets should serve as a basis for the targets in the post-2020 global biodiversity framework but that modifications to these may also be necessary. In this light, many submissions suggested modifications to the existing Aichi Biodiversity Targets. These suggestions have not been included here in order to keep this document to an accessible length. In addition, many submissions provided formulations for targets addressing issues not already covered by the Aichi Biodiversity Targets. These suggestions are included in the annex below. Several submissions also identified specific gaps in the current set of Aichi Biodiversity Targets which should be addressed in the post-2020 global biodiversity framework. These include:

- (a) A greater focus on species;
- (b) Unsustainable and illegal use and trade of wildlife;
- (c) Good governance and financing;
- (d) Conserving important sites for biodiversity;

- (e) Capacity-building;
- (f) Communication;
- (g) Partnerships and empowerment;
- (h) Restoring ecosystem integrity;
- (i) Pollinators;
- (j) Health;
- (k) Biotechnologies;
- (l) Climate change;
- (m) Biodiversity in urban areas;
- (n) Plastics;
- (o) Freshwater;
- (p) Ecosystem integrity, intactness and connectivity;
- (q) Conservation finance;
- (r) Coral reefs;
- (s) Ecosystem-based approaches to climate change adaptation and disaster risk reduction;
- (t) Ocean biodiversity in areas beyond national jurisdiction;
- (u) Territorial and land tenure rights of indigenous peoples and local communities;
- (v) Free prior and informed consent and mutually agreed terms;
- (w) Indigenous peoples and local communities conserved territories and areas (ICCAs) and sacred natural sites;
- (x) Sustainable production;
- (y) Mainstreaming of biodiversity;
- (z) Climate change;
- (aa) Enabling conditions.

5. *Summary*

58. The submissions generally expressed support for the post-2020 global biodiversity framework having a set of targets. There appears to be general support for targets which cover the time period to 2030. However, the need for medium-term targets (2040) and longer-term targets (2050) was also noted. Many submissions suggested using the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020 as a starting point for developing future targets. While there was general support for having a limited number of “SMART” targets many submissions also suggested that there could be sub-targets. Further, while the post-2020 global biodiversity framework should provide an overarching strategy for biodiversity its targets should also be reflect and supportive of other international processes. In this light, it was suggested that the post-2020 global biodiversity framework should facilitate and encourage the development of thematic, regional or sectoral targets and processes that can contribute to any post-2020 targets adopted.

F. **Voluntary commitments and contributions**

59. Decision 14/34 invites Parties and other Governments to consider developing biodiversity commitments which contribute to an effective post-2020 global biodiversity framework and encourages indigenous peoples and local communities and all relevant organizations and stakeholders, including the

private sector, to contribute to the Sharm El-Sheikh to Kunming Action Agenda for Nature and People. Several earlier submissions also commented on the desirability of voluntary commitments. However, others felt that voluntary commitments, while providing useful impetus, may not directly lead the global community to scientifically supported goals and outcomes. In the recent submissions several general issues related to voluntary commitments were raised as were perspectives on how such commitments could be formulated, structured and linked to the post-2020 global biodiversity framework.

1. General views on voluntary commitments and contributions

60. Submissions noted that voluntary commitments could be a way to improve biodiversity mainstreaming, to mobilize other sectors of society and to raise ambition globally. Several submissions pointed to their potential value in helping to galvanize political momentum for implementation, to incentivize action and create opportunities to showcase leadership. It was also noted that 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. It was further suggested that commitments could be a means, particularly for stakeholders, to declare their commitments towards the implementation of the framework. In addition, some suggested that regional commitments should be welcomed. Similarly, some felt that joint initiatives between civil society organizations, the private sector and/or subnational governments could be encouraged. The Global Partnership for Plant Conservation was identified as a possible example of partnership where voluntary contributions to the implementation of the Convention have been made. It was also suggested that partnerships and initiatives could help to maintain momentum for implementation as they extend beyond political cycles.

61. While there appeared to be general support for the idea of voluntary commitments and contributions, some submissions also expressed reservations. Some noted that the commitments in national biodiversity strategies and action plans already serve as national voluntary commitments and that national voluntary commitments should not undermine those plans, or the processes associated with them. Some submissions expressed concerns that voluntary commitments could be used as “public relation exercises” or “green washing” and/or to conceal the absence of real action. In this respect several submissions noted that such commitments should be additional to those that should be included in national biodiversity strategies and action plans. Similarly, some raised concerns that voluntary commitments could cause confusion over the role and status of national biodiversity strategies and action plans. Others noted that if the process for developing a national biodiversity strategy and action plan is comprehensive and participatory, potential voluntary elements could be included in it making a separate process for submitting voluntary commitments unnecessary.

62. It was also noted that national commitments should not just focus on what Parties are willing to achieve but rather on what the available evidence indicates is needed. Potential challenges were also noted in relation to developing common definitions and baselines to facilitate the analysis of national commitments and some emphasized that voluntary commitments should not replace, dilute or deviate from obligations, commitments and formal requirements under the biodiversity-related Conventions and Protocols or weaken the universality of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework. More generally, some suggested that voluntary commitments could lower the level of ambition of the targets and other elements of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework and distract from the implementation of national biodiversity strategies and action plans. Some submissions also pointed to the limitations in the process established under UNFCCC for Nationally Determined Contributions as well as the processes established as part of the Bonn Challenge and the United Nations Oceans Conference as illustration of the limitations associated with processes for voluntary commitments.

2. Mechanisms for voluntary commitments and contributions

63. A number of ways of formalizing the process for voluntary commitments and/or to link them to the post-2020 global biodiversity framework were suggested. Some expressed the view that voluntary commitments should be linked directly to the global objectives and targets adopted under the post-2020 global biodiversity framework. Specifically, with regard to voluntary national commitments, some felt

that these should be developed in a participatory manner, involving all relevant national actors, and that they could also reflect commitments from productive sectors. More generally, it was felt that voluntary commitments should serve as a means of supporting and enhancing implementation of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework.

64. Some submissions expressed the view that national voluntary commitments should be linked to their means of implementation and financing and that clear financial contributions would be needed. It was also noted that the progress made in the implementation of national contributions could help to generate economic and non-economic support for further action. In this respect, some felt that Governments should help to incentivize the development and implementation of voluntary commitments.

65. A few submissions also noted that the review of voluntary commitments should be linked to the process for reviewing the implementation of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework. Some also felt that voluntary commitments should be linked to the indicators used for the post-2020 framework and that an observer organization could be tasked with analysing progress in the implementation of commitments. Others felt that Parties should develop inventories of national indicators and use these to monitor implementation of national commitments. More generally the need for appropriate reporting on voluntary commitments, both in terms of scope and frequency was noted. Using the process of nationally defined contributions employed under UNCCD was suggested as a possible model for a process for voluntary commitments under CBD.

66. A number of submissions provided views on the relationship between the national biodiversity strategies and action plans and voluntary commitments and contributions. Many submissions noted that voluntary commitments should be in addition to and/or compliment national biodiversity strategies and action plans and not replace them. Similarly, the need to structure voluntary commitments in a manner that does not detract from Parties obligations was noted. Relatedly some submissions suggested that a process should be considered for incorporating commitments made by Parties and others into NBSAPs and other national and subnational planning processes as well as the development of verification mechanisms which allow for calculation of voluntary national contributions and commitments.

67. Some submissions felt that voluntary commitments should be tailored to national priorities and capacities and should focus on supporting the attainment of regional and/or global biodiversity priorities. Some submissions also referred to the principal of “common but differentiated responsibility”. Relatedly some suggested that there could be different types of voluntary commitments to reflect different national circumstances. For example, some suggested some commitments could be unconditional while others could be conditional on receiving appropriate support. Similarly, some suggested that Parties in a position to do so could make voluntary commitments to support biodiversity actions in developing countries.

68. Some submissions made a distinction between voluntary commitments made before 2020 and those made after. It was suggested that commitments made before 2020 should be building momentum for the development of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework while those made after 2020 should take the form of national targets to contribute to the globally adopted targets. In the case of commitments developed after 2020, one of their perceived benefits is their potential to act as a ratcheting mechanism to support implementation.

69. It was also suggested that commitments could take many different forms but that in general they should include information on their timing, how they relate to relevant targets, their means of implementation, how they relate to a country’s national biodiversity strategy action plan, how they will be reported on, reviewed and potentially “ratcheted” up. Several submissions also suggested that clear criteria for voluntary commitments or contributions are needed. Some of the criteria suggested were that they should:

- (a) Be additional to national biodiversity strategies and action plans;
- (b) Contribute to the implementation of global, regional or national biodiversity targets;
- (c) Be cross-sectoral and involve different ministries, stakeholders, and sectors;

- (d) Be reflected in national reports and submitted through the website for the Sharm El-Sheikh to Kunming Action Agenda for Nature and People;
- (e) Encourage increased commitment by other Governments and other actors;
- (f) Be commensurate with the ambition of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework.

70. Some submissions also provided perspectives on the establishment of voluntary commitments by non-Party actors. Most submissions suggested that commitments by non-state actors, including the private sector, should be encouraged. Such commitments were viewed as being important to generate a whole of society approach to the implementation of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework. It was also suggested that commitments from the non-party actors should be supported by identifying actions these actors could take and which elements of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework they could support. However, some submissions raised concerns that commitments from the private sector would need to be verified. Further some noted that voluntary commitments from non-Parties should complement or supplement national commitments and not replace them.

3. *Summary*

71. There appears to general support for the promotion of voluntary national commitments or for commitments by other actors. However, many submissions noted that the relationship of these to existing processes, including the national biodiversity strategies and action plans, needs to be clarified. In addition, it was noted that these commitments should not replace other obligations under the Convention but compliment them. It was generally viewed that voluntary commitments should either support the development of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework and/or support its implementation. The need to link voluntary commitments to specific elements of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework was also noted.

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

72. Many earlier submissions noted that the post-2020 global biodiversity framework should be consistent with the commitments, frameworks, processes and plans established by the biodiversity related conventions and other multilateral environmental agreements. Similarly, the need for the post-2020 global biodiversity framework to be coherent with and supportive of the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development, the Paris Agreement, the other two Rio conventions, the other biodiversity-related conventions, and FAO processes, among others, was also frequently noted. Further a general view expressed in several earlier submissions was that the post-2020 global biodiversity framework should be used to reinforce synergies within the United Nations system. Many of the recent submissions expressed similar ideas and/or raise similar issues.

73. There appears to be a general view that the post-2020 global biodiversity framework should be aligned, consistent and avoid duplication with other relevant processes, including the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development, the Rio conventions and the various other biodiversity-related multilateral environmental agreements. The potential of developing synergies between the strategies and processes adopted under these organizations was noted. Further some suggested that alignment with processes and agreements, such as the World Heritage Convention, the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women, the 1995 Beijing Declaration and Platform for Action, the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples, the Sendai Framework on Disaster Risk Reduction 2015-2030, the regional seas conventions, and the Framework Principles on Human Rights and the Environment (United Nations Human Rights Council) should be sought. More generally it was suggested that the post-2020 global biodiversity framework should be endorsed as the biodiversity policy framework throughout the United Nations system and that relevant agreements should be closely involved in the preparation of the post-2020 framework and its subsequent implementation.

74. It was suggested in several submissions that the post-2020 global biodiversity framework could serve as an overarching framework to help promote and guide the work of other relevant organizations. Further, some suggested that a coordination body to assist with implementation across different agreements could be established, noting that many conventions, agreements and processes have similar membership. Others suggested that the Biodiversity Liaison Group could play an enhanced role in this regard. Relatedly, some suggested that the Joint Liaison Group of the Rio Conventions could also play a role in this coordination. Others suggested that IPBES could have a role in promoting integration and suggested that the IPBES and the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) should work more closely together. There were also suggestions for the creation of a more general and centralized forum that would support more holistic approaches to biodiversity governance and facilitate integration.

75. Several submissions suggested possible means of enhancing the relationship between the Convention and other processes in support of the implementation of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework. For example, the potential to develop modular reporting systems for related Conventions was noted and it was suggested that when global level reviews of implementation of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework are undertaken, these should draw on relevant information from other processes. Some submissions pointed to the importance of nature-based solutions and restoration activities, noting their cross-cutting nature, to further support the integration of the Convention with other processes. Also, some suggested that the development of an overarching target in the post-2020 global biodiversity framework relevant to these other processes could also help to promote synergies while others suggested that the targets should be cross-referenced with other relevant processes. Others suggested that the post-2020 global biodiversity framework generally and better in-country coordination could promote integration.

76. Specifically, with regard to the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development, it was noted that some targets directly reflect the Aichi Biodiversity Targets and have an end of 2020 and that these will need to be revised. It was suggested that the Convention and the biodiversity community generally needs to engage in this process, possibly through a high-level panel.

77. While there was general support for having a post-2020 global biodiversity framework which is consistent and supportive of other relevant agreements and encourages synergies, some submissions also raised concerns. Some noted that the scope and nature of these different agreements and processes should not be confused. For example, it was noted that the Convention is a legal treaty whereas the 2030 Agenda is a set of aspirational targets. Further, some noted that while the development a post-2020 global biodiversity framework can be supportive of coherence, integration, and holistic approaches, it should not imply the global governance of natural resources. It was also indicated that the development of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework and the desire for links with other processes should not be a channel for renegotiating commitments under other international instruments and processes.

Summary

78. The submissions were generally consistent in noting the desirability of ensuring integration and synergies between the post-2020 global biodiversity framework and the need to avoid duplication. Many submissions also suggested making better or enhanced use of existing structures and processes to accomplish this. Also, most submissions also noted that the issue of synergies should be accounted for in the post-2020 global biodiversity framework. However, there were few specific suggestions on how to accomplish this.

H. Mainstreaming

79. Decision 14/3 recognized that mainstreaming is critical for achieving the objectives of the Convention, the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020, its Aichi Biodiversity Targets and the 2050 Vision for Biodiversity and should be one of the key elements of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework in order to achieve the transformational change required throughout society and economies, including changes in behaviour and decision-making at all levels. Further, in decisions 14/3 and XIII/3,

several specific sectors were highlighted owing to their dependencies and impacts on biodiversity and identified as areas for development of a long-term strategic approach to biodiversity mainstreaming. Several earlier submissions pointed to the need for the post-2020 global biodiversity framework to offer greater opportunities for the mainstreaming of biodiversity across society and to develop synergies with other processes. The need to have a post-2020 global biodiversity framework which generates buy-in from sectors that are reliant and have significant impact on biodiversity was also noted in many earlier submissions.

80. There was broad support for mainstreaming in the submissions, with many noting its potential to address the direct and indirect pressures on biodiversity. Submissions also noted the need to greatly increase mainstreaming as part of the implementation of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework and noted that this would require effective engagement with relevant actors.

81. Some submissions provided suggestions for how mainstreaming could be reflected in the post-2020 global biodiversity framework. It was noted that the issue of mainstreaming is already addressed, at least to a certain extent, by the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020 as part of Aichi Biodiversity Targets 6 and 7. Further, it was suggested that Aichi Target 4 could also be relevant to mainstreaming. As such these Targets could serve as a starting point for addressing mainstreaming in the post-2020 global biodiversity framework. Relatedly some noted that it would be challenging to address all the relevant sectors with only one target and, as a result, multiple targets on this issue may be needed. Some suggested that headline targets on ecosystem services could also help to create support for mainstreaming. It was also suggested that the global targets should be able to be disaggregated to the national level to facilitate mainstreaming. It was also suggested that one of the aims of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework should be to ensure that by 2030, all investments, policies, programmes, and plans or actions of relevant sectors do not undermine efforts to address biodiversity loss. It was also suggested that mainstreaming be included as a cross-cutting approach.

1. Focus of mainstreaming

82. It was suggested that the post-2020 global biodiversity framework should focus on those sectors which are having particularly large impacts on biodiversity. In this respect the sectors identified during the last meeting of the Conference of the Parties under the agenda items on mainstreaming were suggested as a possible focus. Others suggested focusing on agriculture, and productive landscapes and seascapes. It was also suggested that mainstreaming should focus on the promotion of multi-level governance and cooperation as well as vertical integration. However, one submission also cautioned against trying to focus on too much and to rather focus on the key sectors that drive biodiversity loss.

83. Some suggested that the overall focus should be on promoting sustainable production, consumption and use and finding an appropriate balance between development, poverty alleviation and food security. Other suggested it should be on bringing about the necessary economic and behavioural changes needed for mainstreaming. Some submissions also highlighted the links between mainstreaming and the Sustainable Development Goals and one submission noted that the activities and projects conducted under the International Partnership for the Satoyama Initiative could be useful examples of mainstreaming.

2. Actions for mainstreaming

84. Some submissions suggested that the post-2020 global biodiversity framework should focus on promoting actions and best practices for sustainable production. Some of these include a greater focus on promoting biodiversity in sectoral policies, a better recognition of the multiple values of biodiversity, greater collaboration with related international agreements, greater capacity-building support, greater use of strategic environmental impact assessment, promoting concept related to the circular economy and better supply chain management. However, it was also noted that the framework should not be prescriptive in identifying actions but allow the sectors to identify targets or elements they can contribute to. The need to develop a mechanism to ensure consultation with key stakeholders and industries to

develop mainstreaming plans was noted. One submission also noted that gender issues should be an integral part of mainstreaming biodiversity in order to support Sustainable Development Goal 5 on achieving gender equality and empowering all women and girls.

3. *Tools to support mainstreaming*

85. A number of tools and/or approaches to mainstreaming were identified as being relevant to the post-2020 global biodiversity framework. Some pointed to the need to be strategic and stressed the importance of the process set out in decision 14/3. Others pointed to the continued relevance of the programmes of work adopted under the Convention on Biological Diversity. Others pointed to the need for effective communication on this issue and the need to reach and engage with the broadest possible range of stakeholders. The need for bottom-up approaches to mainstreaming as well as the need to better engage the private sector, including by making greater use of opportunities for engagement such as through the World Economic Forum and the Global Partnership for Business and Biodiversity, were also noted. Similarly, some suggested the need to have a greater involvement of land holders and the users of resources. Some specific tools and approaches for mainstreaming that were suggested were:

- (a) The Chennai Guidance for the Integration of Biodiversity and Poverty Eradication;⁶
- (b) Natural capital accounting;
- (c) Landscape and sea scape approaches;
- (d) Transparency protocols;
- (e) The Sharm el Sheikh to Kunming Action Agenda;
- (f) The [FAO Biodiversity Mainstreaming Platform](#).

4. *Summary*

86. Most submissions noted the importance of mainstreaming to the success of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework. The majority of submissions appear to suggest that the frameworks should address mainstreaming as an overarching issue. Further while multiple targets could relate to mainstreaming, for example given their focus on specific ecosystems or ecosystem services, there should not be a mainstreaming target as such. The issue of mainstreaming was generally viewed as being important for the implementation of the plan.

I. **Relationship with the current Strategic Plan**

87. Many of the earlier submissions noted that the post-2020 global biodiversity framework should build from the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020 and use this as a baseline. In recent submissions this view was also expressed. In addition, a number of lessons from the experience in implementing the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020 were identified:

(g) *National biodiversity strategies and action plans* – Some noted that the process of developing, updating or revising NBSAPs after the adoption of the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020 was lengthy and delayed national implementation. As such some noted that more efforts are needed to streamline this process. In addition, it was noted that the guidance developed by COP for NBSAPs was very flexible, resulting in different types and levels of detail in the NBSAPs which in turn created challenges for monitoring implementation;

(h) *Targets, indicators and reporting* - Some noted that future targets need to be more measurable, realistic, and achievable, and that there needs to be a succinct, and an overarching target, similar to the 2°C target under UNFCCC. The need for fewer targets was also noted as was the need for more harmonization between national and global targets. Relatedly indicators are also needed, and these should be developed as part of the process of developing future biodiversity targets. Similarly, it was

⁶ Decision XII/5, annex.

suggested that the reporting structure of the next round of national reports should be developed in parallel to the development of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework. (The issues of targets and indicators are further addressed in sections E, and J respectively);

(i) *Review mechanism* – Some submissions noted that a more effective means for reviewing implementation of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework is needed (this issue is further addressed in section N);

(j) *Benefit-sharing* – Some noted the need for the establishment of an effective mechanism to ensure the sharing of benefits arising out of the utilization of genetic resources, including those arising from digital sequence information on genetic resources, would be crucial for reaching the third objective of the Convention;

(k) *Means of implementation* – A number of submissions noted that the means of implementation for the post-2020 global biodiversity framework need to be enhanced, including resource mobilization, capacity building and technology transfer;

(l) *Mainstreaming* – Some submissions noted that the lack of mainstreaming was a hindrance to the implementation of the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020 and that this should be addressed in the future framework. Similarly, the need for innovative ways to integrate biodiversity in the economic sectors was also noted;

(m) *Awareness raising* – The need for greater awareness of the values of biodiversity and the pressures on it was noted in some submissions. Related the need to better quantify the benefits from biodiversity and ecosystem services was also noted.

88. In addition to these lessons, some submissions also identified issues that should be more strongly reflected in the post-2020 global biodiversity framework including:

- (a) Implementation of the Nagoya and Cartagena Protocols;
- (b) Links to the programmes of work of the Convention;
- (c) Restoration;
- (d) Gender, the role, rights and participation of women in biodiversity conservation and restoration;
- (e) Invasive alien species;
- (f) Increased sustainable agricultural practices;
- (g) Protecting landscapes and seascapes;
- (h) Enhancing ecosystem-based adaptation;
- (i) Natural capital accounting;
- (j) Overexploitation;
- (k) Pollution;
- (l) Building political momentum for implementation;
- (m) The drivers of biodiversity loss;
- (n) Illegal wildlife trade;
- (o) Habitat connectivity;
- (p) Freshwater.

Summary

89. There is general support for using the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020 as a starting point/baseline for developing the post-2020 global biodiversity framework. Further, most submissions referred to the need to ensure that all three objectives of the Convention are reflected more clearly and in a balanced manner. The need to enhance the means of implementation, to better internalize the plan in decision-making and ensure that enhanced mechanisms are in place to monitor and review its implementation were also noted in many submissions.

J. Indicators

90. The importance of identifying indicators for the different elements of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework was noted in many earlier submissions. Most suggested that the starting point for indicators should be the indicators developed for the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020 noted in decision XIII/28. The indicators used in the IPBES global assessment were also suggested. The need for indicators which could be used at the global and regional levels was also noted. The recent submissions expressed similar views.

91. Several submissions noted that indicators should be developed at the same time as the post-2020 global biodiversity framework and that the existing indicators identified by COP and by other relevant processes should be used as a starting point. However, one submission noted that the development of indicators should only take place once the targets for the post-2020 global biodiversity framework have been agreed so it is clear what needs to be measured.

92. While there was general support for building from indicators previously identified for the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020, many submissions also noted that the list of indicators should be further developed and updated and noted that it should not be regarded as a “closed list”. In this regard, a number of submissions have identified possible indicators which could be used to monitor the implementation of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework depending on its final scope and content. In addition, several submissions suggested that the indicators used for the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development, in the IPBES global assessment, recent indicators identified through the Biodiversity Indicators Partnership and indicators used in the sixth national reports should be considered in the post-2020 global biodiversity framework.

93. The need to ensure that all future targets can be monitored with at least one indicator was noted and that global datasets and/or national datasets which can be aggregated are needed for this purpose. The need for indicators which also meet the “SMART” criteria was also noted. Others noted the need for a more pragmatic approach and to use indicators which are already available and to encourage indicator developers to develop indicators to address any gaps. Others suggested that a small core set of indicators to facilitate reporting may be helpful. The possible role of SBSTTA in assessing new indicators was noted.

94. Some submissions suggested that global indicators could be complimented with national indicators. However other noted that developing national indicators is a costly process in terms of time and resource . While others noted that guidance is needed for the development of national indicators. It was also suggested that global indicators should have the ability of be aggregated and/or disaggregated to facilitate their use at multiple levels.

95. Several submissions also identified criteria that it would be beneficial for indicators to have. Some expressed the view that indicators should focus on outcomes while others suggested they should also cover processes. The need for indicators to address all issues addressed by the post-2020 global biodiversity framework, including bio-cultural issues, was also noted. Several submissions noted the importance of having indicators which could be updated regularly and which would cover the implementation period of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework. In this respect, the importance of open-access data, remote sensing information, modelling and back casting approaches and essential biodiversity variables (EBVs) was noted. In addition, several tools and approaches to improve the use of

indicators were noted, including the Biodiversity Indicators Partnership Dashboard, the Integrated Biodiversity Assessment Tool (IBAT), and the System of Environmental Economic Accounting. Others emphasized the importance of developing online platforms of indicator information directly related to the post-2020 global biodiversity framework and or ensuring that indicator development is sustainably funded.

Summary

96. There is general support for identifying indicators for the post-2020 global biodiversity framework at the same time as the framework is being developed. There is also generally support for using the indicators identified in decision XIII/28 as a starting point for this. However, there is also support for further developing this list of indicators to take into account recent advances in this field by organizations such as IPBES and the Biodiversity Indicators Partnership.

K. Implementation and NBSAPs

97. Many earlier submissions noted the need to emphasize implementation in the post-2020 global biodiversity framework. The continued relevance of the NBSAPs for implementing the Convention was also emphasized; however, many earlier submissions also noted that the NBSAP process needs to be strengthened and accountability enhanced. Further, many earlier submissions noted the need for additional mechanisms to support implementation. In the recent submissions similar views were shared. Further, several ways to further strengthen the NBSAP process were identified.

98. It was noted, that as many countries have recently updated their NBSAPs, the focus in the post-2020 period should be on their implementation and monitoring rather than on their revision. Similarly, some submissions noted the delays between the adoption of the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020 and the revision of NBSAPs and pointed to the need to avoid a similar situation with the post-2020 global biodiversity framework. Some noted that NBSAPs need to be aligned with the post-2020 global biodiversity framework and its targets, while others suggested that Parties should undertake a review of their NBSAPs to determine their degree of alignment with the post-2020 global biodiversity and only undertake revisions as required.

99. Some submissions suggested that the scope of NBSAP's needs to be broadened to reflect sectoral policies, have a greater focus on sustainable use, enhance integration, reflect local biodiversity issues, promote biodiversity as a cross-cutting theme in national governments, pay greater attention to synergies among relevant processes, and have a greater involvement of stakeholders and rightsholders in their development. Some submission suggested that the NBSAPs should be developed to implement the Rio conventions in an integrated way. Similarly, it was suggested that NBSAPs should also take into account the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development. One submission suggested that the NBSAPs should also reflect countries' impacts and commitments to biodiversity outside of its national borders.

100. More generally the need to ensure more comparability and consistency in the NBSAPs was noted. Some submissions suggested that the comparability of NBSAPs could be enhanced through the development and adoption of new guidelines or templates for their development and that these guidelines should be developed at the same time as the post-2020 global biodiversity framework. Others suggested that guidelines or templates should be created for the development of national biodiversity targets related to those in the post-2020 global biodiversity framework. It was also suggested that the Conference of the Parties, at its next meeting, should identify some mandatory elements for NBSAPS, including indicators, biodiversity monitoring, reporting and review mechanisms for NBSAPs, which could be agreed at a subsequent meeting of COP. Further, it was noted that there may be a perception that NBSAPs are not binding or official and that this should be addressed to make them more actionable and create greater accountability. In this respect some submissions pointed to the need to have NBSAPs adopted as whole of government policy instruments. Some suggested that NBSAPS should be framed in a similar manner to the nationally determined contributions (NDCs) under the UNFCCC. However other submissions noted

that the NBSAPs need to remain flexible to able to address national circumstances and priorities and to not overreach the mandate of the Convention.

101. Some submissions suggested that a mechanism to review NBSAPs and share best practices should be developed as part of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework. Such a mechanism could also contribute to the transparency of the NBSAP process. Similarly, some submissions suggested that mechanisms should be developed to review and monitor the implementation of national biodiversity strategies and action plans.

102. Some submissions also identified tools that could be used to enhance or strengthen NBSAPS. These include the greater and more effective use of indicators and criteria to monitor national progress and the further development and enhancement of online reporting tools. It was also suggested that an analysis of the level of compliance in submitting reports to the Convention should be undertaken. The importance of addressing issues associated with the means of implementation, including financial and human resources and capacity building, was also highlighted.

103. In addition to national biodiversity strategies and action plans, some submissions noted that other types of strategies and plans could assist with implementation. Types of strategies identified in the submissions as being particularly important were local biodiversity strategies and action plans and regional biodiversity strategies and action plans. It was also suggested that Parties could be encouraged to develop “rolling plans of actions” which would contain their series of nationally determined actions and goals to contribute to the implementation of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework. These action plans would be high level and convey national priorities generally, be linked to the review of implementation of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework and be periodically updated.

Summary

104. Submissions were consistent in noting the continued relevance and importance of national biodiversity strategies and action plans as the main instrument to implement the post-2020 global biodiversity framework. Some suggested that national biodiversity strategies and action plans should be revised to reflect the post-2020 global biodiversity framework. However, others suggested that the focus should be on the implementation of NBSAPs and therefore changes to them should be limited to essential updates to align them with the post-2020 global biodiversity framework so as to avoid distraction. The need for more commonality between the NBSAPs, and enhanced review and monitoring mechanisms were also frequently noted.

L. Resource mobilization

105. Decision 14/22 affirms that resource mobilization will be an integral part of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework and through it COP decided to initiate preparations on this component at an early stage in the process of developing the framework, in full coherence and coordination with the overall process for the post-2020 framework. Further, the decision also tasked an expert panel to undertake several activities and to prepare reports to contribute to the overall process for the post-2020 framework. The importance of resource mobilization has also been underlined in many earlier submissions on the post-2020 global biodiversity framework. The more recent submissions have continued to emphasize the importance of resource mobilization as well as identifying general considerations and issues to be considered as part of the development of a resource mobilization strategy for the post-2020 global biodiversity framework.

106. Many submissions noted that reliable sources of funding are critical to the success of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework. Further, it was noted that if it is the desire to have a post-2020 global biodiversity framework which brings about a transformational change in society's relation with biodiversity, there will be a needed for a transformational change in resource mobilization.

107. Some submissions have suggested that a more concrete and holistic approach to resource mobilization is needed. Others have pointed to the need for participatory approaches to mobilize resources from all sources and some have noted the need for greater awareness of the economic values

and benefits of biodiversity. One submission noted that mechanisms should be available for civil society, youth and women to access resources.

108. Several submissions also referred to Article 20 of the Convention. However, it was also noted that while official development assistance has close to doubled, this has not had an apparent effect on the overall status and trends of biodiversity and therefore innovative ways to mobilize additional resources are needed. Others have noted the need to approach resource mobilization in a pragmatic way while a few submissions highlighted the relevance of the study on resource mobilization called for in decision 14/22 in determining what will be needed.

109. It was suggested that a standing committee on resource mobilization could be established to oversee the development of a comprehensive resource mobilization strategy and the setting of specific targets for the resource mobilization elements of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework. In addition to general issues, many submissions also identified possible elements for a resource mobilization strategy and/or for the post-2020 global biodiversity framework:

(a) *Generate resources from all sources* – Several submissions noted that the resource mobilization strategy should aim to generate resources from various sources, including domestic public budgets, official development assistance, and private sector investment. Similarly, several submissions noted to need to make use of innovative approaches to resource mobilization including payments for ecosystem services, subsidy reform, blended financing, the creation of incentives, greater involvement of the private sector, public-private strategies and partnerships and compensation schemes. Reference to the Addis Ababa Action Agenda on Financing for Development was also made. However, it was also noted that while generating resources from all sources should be encourage, such an approach should not detract from the financial obligations of Parties under Article 20 of the Convention;

(b) *Synergies with other processes* – The need to leverage funds available through other processes was noted as was the potential role of biodiversity mainstreaming in increasing the overall amount of resources available for biodiversity. Similarly promoting alignment across sectoral policies was identified as a possible means of facilitating resource mobilization. Relatedly it was noted that means of ensuring that funds provided through official development assistance broadly do not have unintended negative impacts on biodiversity;

(c) *New funds* – Several submissions suggested that additional biodiversity funds could be developed as a compliment to the Global Environment Facility. The Land Degradation Neutrality Fund and the Green Climate Fund were suggested as possible models for such funds. Similarly, it was suggested that regional biodiversity funds could also be developed. Relatedly there was a suggestion that the concept of resource mobilization should be broadened to “biodiversity financing” to better capture the range of funding options and approaches available. In this respect the work of the BIOFIN initiative was noted.

110. Many submissions referred to the need for specific resource mobilization targets. Some submissions suggested that there should be one overarching target, like Aichi Biodiversity Target 20. Others suggested that there should be a target focused on incentives, like Aichi Biodiversity Target 3, which helps to highlight the costs and benefits of policy reforms as a step towards engaging finance and development ministries and the private sector. However, others suggested that there should be a set of targets related to resource mobilization or that there could be sub-targets related to each future biodiversity target. Similarly, some submissions suggested that rather than having a target on resource mobilization, the focus should be on biodiversity financing more generally. Relatedly some submissions noted the need to reflect biodiversity finance plans in national biodiversity strategies and action plans. Similarly, the need to account for negative externalities in policies and investment decisions was noted.

111. While many submissions noted the potential role that the private sector could play in mobilizing resources for the implementation of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework, several submissions also raised concerns. Some suggested that for funding from the private sector safeguards need to be put in

place, and that private sector funding should not detract from the principle of common but differentiated responsibilities. Some submissions also noted the role of multilateral, national, regional and local financial institutions in enabling private sector investment through the use of risk mitigation tools. Other submissions suggested that the private sector should be encouraged or enabled to invest in or support biodiversity directly, for example by helping to finance natural infrastructure, by developing sustainable supply chains, using natural climate solutions and using biodiversity offsets. However, some submissions also cautioned against trying to put a monetary value on biodiversity given that its importance goes beyond economic markets and is essential to life.

112. Other submissions noted that resource mobilization is only one of the needed enabling elements for the post-2020 global biodiversity framework. Other important enabling elements identified were capacity-building, scientific and technical cooperation, technology transfer and south-south cooperation. Some submissions also referred to the importance of a capacity-building strategy for the post-2020 global biodiversity framework. In addition, several submissions suggested new approaches or tools to mobilize resources, including the Legacy Landscapes Approach, conservation bonds, natural capital accounting and its integration into the System of National Accounts, the enhancement of finance sector safeguards and transparency, and the development of regional funding strategies. Relatedly, many submissions pointed to the need for a more holistic approach to resource mobilization and biodiversity financing.

Summary

113. There is general recognition that resource mobilization will be a crucial element of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework. Most submissions are in favour of broadening the approach for resource mobilization to seek funds from all possible and innovative sources. However, many submissions also noted that these additional funding channels should not detract from Parties' obligations under the Convention. Similarly, while there was general support for the involvement of the private sector there were also concerns and the need for appropriate safeguards was noted.

M. Financial mechanisms

114. Decision 14/23 welcomes the successful conclusion of the seventh replenishment of the Global Environment Facility Trust Fund and expresses appreciation for the continuing financial support from Parties and Governments for carrying out the tasks under the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020 in its remaining years, and for supporting the implementation of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework in its first two years.

115. Several of the submissions noted that GEF should play an important role in the implementation of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework and identified ways for GEF to support Parties in implementing the post-2020 global biodiversity framework including by aligning its biodiversity programming with the post-2020 global biodiversity framework, maximizing the amount of funding available under the GEF Biodiversity Focal Area and ensuring that biodiversity co-benefits are fully captured when addressing climate change and land degradation through the GEF's impact programmes and the use of nature-based solutions. Other issues raised in the submissions were having greater support for national biodiversity strategies and action plans, developing specific funding lines for implementing the post-2020 global biodiversity framework, and ensuring that GEF responds to the three objectives of the Convention.

116. Some submissions identified non-financial support that GEF could provide to help implement the post 2020-global biodiversity framework, including providing more support to national focal points in developing GEF-eligible projects and other technical support. Some submissions also noted that GEF could play an important role in convening Parties, diverse actors and financial organizations to encourage the development and growth of innovative financing, such as green bonds, impact investments, and revolving funds, among other things. It was also suggested that the GEF should more systematically take into account the results of the evaluations of the Independent Evaluation Office and that the guidelines for

the next GEF replenishment be undertaken by the GEF Council to allow for full participation and constructive dialogue between beneficiaries and donors.

117. Generally, the importance of the GEF-8 replenishment for the post-2020 global biodiversity was noted as was the need for the ambition of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework to be reflected in its replenishment. Several submissions also suggested ways to increase the amount of resources provided through GEF. These suggestions including encouraging donors to increase their funding support, engaging more with the private sector, making use of micro-financing schemes, and creating endowment funds. The need to be able to access smaller amounts of funding and to access funding more quickly to enable countries to respond to urgent issues and opportunities was also noted. Relatedly, some submissions suggested that GEF should broaden the scope of the projects and activities it supports. Suggestions included more support for longer-term projects related to planning, monitoring and enforcement, greater follow up of previously funded projects, support for indicator development and other tools for monitoring implementation and support for joint projects conducted by several countries.

Summary

118. The importance of GEF to the implementation of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework was noted in many submissions. The importance of its support to multi-focal area projects which contribute to synergistic implementation of the Rio conventions was noted. A number of submissions also noted the need to scale up the amount of funding provided through the GEF and proposed various means of doing this.

N. Review process and mechanisms

119. The need for an effective and timely review process for the post-2020 global biodiversity framework was noted in many earlier submissions. In this respect, the continued importance of the national reports and the clearing-house mechanism of the Convention were also highlighted. However, the need for more effective, robust and accountable national reporting was also emphasized. In addition, many earlier submissions suggested additional mechanisms for reviewing progress in implementation and for building accountability and transparency. In recent submissions, there was general support for the continued role of national reporting and several submissions suggested ways to enhance the national reporting process. In addition, some submissions suggested additional review processes while others made distinctions between reviews of national implementation and reviews of global implementation.

1. Review of the national reports

120. Some of the submissions specifically addressed means of reviewing national implementation. Some felt that the national reports should continue to be used for this purpose but that the reporting process should be strengthened, including by using standardized or harmonized indicators, developing clear criteria and procedures, and by integrating measures to judge the continuity of effort. Similarly, some submissions noted the need for greater consistency between the national reports to allow for information to be aggregated. However, others felt that the national reporting process should be simplified.

121. Some submissions provided perspectives on what should be included in future rounds of national reporting. Suggestions included a greater focus on the actions that have been taken in the context of national and global targets, challenges encountered in implementation, the greater use of headline indicators, greater complementarity with other relevant reporting process, and the greater use of online reporting and data management tools. Further some submissions stressed the importance of domestic national engagement, including from indigenous peoples and local communities, civil society and the private sector, in the development of national reports.

122. Some submissions suggested that the national reports should go through an external review process. In this light, some submissions suggested that the voluntary peer-review mechanism methodology developed under the Convention should be further developed and used for reviewing implementation. Alternatively, some suggested that models like those used by UNFCCC or OECD could

be used. Others suggested that SBSTTA should develop a scientific peer-review framework to assess NBSAPS and national reports. Similarly, it was suggested that such a review of national reports and NBSAPs could be undertaken as part of interactive dialogue at meetings of SBSTTA, SBI or COP. Alternatively, some felt that review processes should focus on identifying cases of low or minimal compliance with the post-2020 global biodiversity framework while others noted that they should be focused on determining if the collective efforts of Parties are enough to reach the post-2020 global biodiversity framework. There was also a suggestion that as part of the national reporting process, Parties should also provide a report indicating how they plan on addressing the challenges and obstacles identified in their national reports and that such a document could be part of a possible national “rolling plan of action”. It was also suggested that such a process would help to improve accountability, transparency and informing decisions on possible corrective measures. It was also noted that national reviews should consider varying capacities and that not all countries are starting from the same level.

2. Additional review mechanisms

123. Those submissions suggesting additional review mechanisms noted that they should be technical, objective, transparent, non-adversarial and non-punitive in nature and aim to identify weaknesses and opportunities in implementing the post-2020 global biodiversity framework. It was also suggested that the review mechanisms should review both outcomes and effectiveness. The need for regular assessments was also highlighted, with some submissions suggesting a two- or four-year cycle. The possibility of developing short, medium- and long-term measures, targets or milestones for reviewing progress was suggested. The need to have space for the participation of all stakeholders was also emphasized. However, some submissions were of the opinion that the review process for the post-2020 global biodiversity framework should continue to be through the national reports and did not believe that new mechanisms were necessary. Others felt that the national reports should continue to be used for reviewing progress but should be strengthened. It was also suggested that organizations, such as IPBES or GEO-BON, could be tasked with reviewing progress in implementing the post-2020 global biodiversity framework. While others expressed support for the process outlined in decision 14/29 on review mechanisms.

124. The importance of having the basic elements of a review mechanisms developed in parallel to the post-2020 global biodiversity framework was noted. Some suggested that a coordination mechanism to support the review process could be developed and pointed to the successes with the Global Strategy for Plan Conservation in this respect. It was also suggested that coordination mechanisms or groups could be established for the post-2020 global biodiversity framework generally or for specific groups of targets.

125. Several submissions noted the need for broad engagement in the review process. The participation of indigenous peoples and local communities, civil society organizations and local and subnational authorities were noted as being particularly important. Further it was suggested that the Rio conventions and other multilateral environmental agreements should be invited to participate. Others noted that such reviews of implementation could help to serve as a part of a “ratcheting mechanism” for supporting implementation.

3. Summary

126. Most submissions noted the importance of effective review processes for the implementation of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework. There appears to be general support for basing these on the NBSAPs and the national reports, though a number of additional mechanisms were also proposed. The importance of regular or cyclical reviews of progress was identified as being important to the identification of obstacles, challenges and lessons learned. Further many submissions also noted the needed to ensure that both NBSAPs and national reports were more robust and comparable, and that reviews of these provide more actionable information and are undertaken in a more timely and effective way. There is also general support for considering the issue of review mechanisms in parallel to the development of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework and it was suggested that the review mechanisms from other relevant processes could provide some lessons in this regard.

O. Relationship between the Convention and the Protocols

127. Decision CP-9/7 provides that biosafety should be reflected in the post-2020 global biodiversity framework and sets out steps towards the preparation of the biosafety component of the post-2020 framework. The decision also sets out a process for developing a specific implementation plan for the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety as a follow-up to the Strategic Plan for the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety for the period 2011-2020. Further access and benefit-sharing is one of the three objectives of the Convention and decision 14/31 and decision NP-3/15 specify that issues related to access and benefit-sharing and the Nagoya Protocol should be considered in the development of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework. In recent submissions general issues related to the relationship between the Convention and its two Protocols have been raised. In addition, specific suggestions on how issues related to biosafety and access and benefit-sharing could be reflected in the post-2020 global biodiversity framework were also made.

128. As noted above, many submissions have noted that the post-2020 global biodiversity framework should address the three objectives of the Convention in a balanced manner. However, several submissions have pointed out that as the two Protocols do not have the same membership as the Convention, care needs to be given to ensure that the post-2020 global biodiversity framework addresses general issues related to biosafety and access and benefit-sharing and not be focused specifically on the Protocols themselves. Relatedly, it was noted that the two Protocols are separate legal instruments which support the objectives of the Convention and therefore any decisions regarding standalone strategies for the Protocols can only be made by their respective Parties. However, it was also suggested that any targets, strategies or indicators developed under the Protocols should be supportive of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework and contribute to integration and greater cooperation between the Convention and Protocols. Others suggested that the post-2020 global biodiversity framework should help to support the further ratification of the Protocols.

129. A number of submissions suggested that issues related to biosafety and access and benefit-sharing could be addressed through the development of specific targets related to these issues (see the sub-sections below). However, it was also suggested that a general target which refers to the approaches adopted under the Protocols could also be developed.

1. Biosafety

130. There appears to be general support for reflecting biosafety issues in the post-2020 global biodiversity framework. Most submissions suggest that this could be done by developing a target related to biosafety. One general view is that any targets related to biosafety should focus on Parties commitments under the Convention. For example, some have suggested the post-2020 global biodiversity framework should focus on issues addressed in the Articles of the Convention, including Article 8 (In-situ Conservation) and Article 19 (Handling of biotechnology and distribution of its benefits). In this light, it was suggested that a biosafety target for the post-2020 global biodiversity framework could be “all Parties possess and maintain the regulatory framework and the capacity to regulate, manage or control the risks associated with the use and release of living modified organisms which are likely to have adverse environmental impacts that could affect the conservation and sustainable use of biological diversity, taking also into account the risks to human health.” Others suggested that a target could focus on the need for further ratification of the Cartagena Protocol, including ratification of the Nagoya – Kuala Lumpur Supplementary Protocol on Liability and Redress.

131. More generally, some submissions have suggested that issues related to the integration of the work of the Convention and the Cartagena Protocol should be reflected in the post-2020 global biodiversity framework. Other suggestions were for the future framework to promote developing country participation in biotechnology research, as well as promoting access, on mutually agreed terms, to the results and benefits arising from biotechnologies through the post-2020 global biodiversity framework. Further, a number of submissions addressed issues related to emerging technologies, including synthetic biology and gene editing, and the degree to which they are or are not covered under the Convention and

the Cartagena Protocol. Some suggested that the post-2020 global biodiversity framework should take such innovations into account.

132. As noted above, decision CP-9/7 sets out steps towards the preparation of the biosafety component of the post-2020 framework and a process for developing a specific Implementation Plan for the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety as a follow-up to the Strategic Plan for the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety for the period 2011-2020. In response to this decision a notification was issued inviting comments on possible relevant elements of the biosafety component of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework, the structure and content of the Implementation Plan for the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety post-2020 and possible elements of a specific action plan for capacity-building on biosafety, covering the Cartagena Protocol and its Supplementary Protocol. Based on the submissions received a document has been prepared to further explore these issues and it may help to inform the discussions on the scope and content of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework.⁷

2. Access and benefit-sharing

133. There appears to be general support for reflecting access and benefit-sharing in the post-2020 global biodiversity framework. Most suggest that this could be done through a target related to access and benefit-sharing generally and possibly linked to Article 15 (Access to Genetic Resources) of the Convention. However, others felt that it should focus on the practical implementation of the Nagoya Protocol or on operationalization of access and benefit-sharing systems and policies more generically. Alternatively, some have suggested that the post-2020 global biodiversity framework should include measurable targets related to how access and benefit sharing can contribute to conservation by fostering collaborative research, or investments in capacity-building and natural sciences research and education. Others suggested that the focus should be on establishing or improving institutional structures, legislative/policy and regulatory measures on access and benefit-sharing. It was also suggested that there could be a focus on more integrated approaches to capacity-building, the clearing-house mechanisms, resource mobilization, and national reporting.

134. More generally some submissions have suggested that issues related to the integration of the work of the Convention and the Nagoya Protocol should be reflected in the post-2020 global biodiversity framework. Some suggested that the post 2020 global biodiversity framework should reflect issues related to effective free, prior and informed consent, incorporating access and benefit-sharing elements in existing community protocols, promote regional approaches to access and benefit-sharing, support for national level actions on access and benefit-sharing related to indigenous peoples and local communities.

135. Some felt that there should be an element aimed at responding to emerging rapid technological advance, including those related to digital sequence information on genetic resources. However, others noted that decision 14/20 sets out a process for considering the issue of digital sequence information and that the results of that process should not be pre-judged.

3. Summary

136. Submissions were generally in agreement that biosafety and access and benefit-sharing should be reflected in the post-2020 global biodiversity framework. Numerous submissions suggested that this should be done through one or several targets. Most submissions suggested that the targets that should focus on general issues related to biosafety and access and benefit-sharing rather than focusing on specific issues related to the Protocols. However, some submissions suggested that the focus should be on further operationalizing the Protocols. It was also suggested that issues related to biosafety and access and benefit-sharing should be reflected in the post-2020 global biodiversity framework in a more general manner. Several submissions noted the relevance of digital sequence information and synthetic biology to the discussion on the relation between the Convention and its Protocols in the post-2020 global biodiversity framework.

⁷ The document is accessible from <https://bch.cbd.int/protocol/post2020/#>

P. Integrating diverse perspectives

137. Many earlier submissions noted that the development and implementation of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework will require a “whole of society approach”. The need to have greater involvement of some specific groups, including indigenous peoples and local communities, women and gender organizations, subnational governments, cities and other local authorities, civil society, youth and the private sector were repeatedly emphasized. In recent submissions similar perspectives were again raised.

138. Most submissions expressed general support for the active involvement and participation of all stakeholders in the development and implementation of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework, with several submissions noting that the ongoing loss of biodiversity is too great a problem for Parties to tackle on their own. The important role of national governments in promoting or enabling action by stakeholders was also noted. However, several submissions also noted that the consultation and involvement process would be best carried out at the national level, in order to account for national laws and circumstances. It was also noted that stakeholders can also participate in the meetings of the open-ended working group and other relevant consultations.

139. Several submissions observed that appropriate institutional structures need to be put in place to allow and enable stakeholders to participate effectively in the development and implementation of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework. Some suggested tools or approaches to involve stakeholders including Parties building national digital platforms to facilitate consultations, preparing guidance and documentation tailored to the specific needs of each group, revising the website of the Convention on Biological Diversity to make information more easily accessible and/or preparing an overarching guidance document related to engagement. Some suggested that stakeholders should be involved through the development and implementation of national biodiversity strategies and action plans and that NBSAPs should be more participatory. The possibility of creating national citizen assemblies and establishing specific funds to support the involvement of stakeholders in the implementation of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework were suggested. Other submissions suggested models that could be emulated to support the activate involvement of stakeholders, including the Energy Task Force of the Convention on Migratory Species and the GEF-funded Migratory Soaring Birds Project.

140. With regard to the post-2020 global biodiversity framework, some submissions suggested that it should refer to the need for Parties to explore how to involve stakeholders in implementation and highlight the importance of stakeholders in this regard. Others suggested that the framework should call for more concrete commitments from stakeholders while some suggested that participation could be an overarching element for the implementation of the framework. Relatedly, it was suggested that participation could be used as an indicator for monitoring and reviewing implementation of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework. In addition to the need to reflect specific groups, a number of submissions also commented on the need for a greater focus on the relationship between nature and cultures and suggested that this should be an important element of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework. The work on nature-culture linkages undertaken by UNESCO, IUCN and other actors was noted as a possible starting point for this.

1. Indigenous peoples and local communities

141. With regard to the scope and content of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework, some submissions suggested that the participation indigenous peoples and local communities could be included as an overarching principle that applies to the entirety of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework. Others suggested that a specific target related to traditional knowledge and customary sustainable use could be developed, however others suggested a target which focuses on the desired outcomes of application of traditional knowledge, innovations and practices in the context of the conservation and sustainable use of biological diversity. Others suggested focusing on strengthening equity and inclusion in

all post-2020 targets. It was also suggested that a target related to Article 10(c)⁸ of the Convention could be developed. It was also suggested that the voluntary glossary annexed to CBD decision 14/13 could help to reflect biodiversity in the post-2020 global biodiversity framework and to address it in a cross-cutting manner.

142. Others suggested that issues related to other effective conservation measures and Indigenous and Community Conserved Areas should be integrated across all relevant targets. Conversely it was suggested the issues related to indigenous peoples and local communities, including their rights to biodiversity, should be reflected in the chapeau of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework and be positioned as an enabling element for its implementation and a prerequisite to its success. More generally it was also suggested that the post-2020 global biodiversity framework should have a rights-based approach.

143. Some suggested that the participation and involvement of indigenous peoples and local communities should be an enabling condition for the implementation, achievement and evaluation of the framework. One submission also suggested that indicators, such as the number of species of wild flora and fauna that are preserved, protected or exploited by indigenous peoples and local communities or the number of traditional practices incorporated into new technologies (innovation) that support territorial self-management and conservation, and use of biodiversity related to indigenous peoples and local communities, could be used in the framework.

144. Submissions also provided comments on the need to encourage the involvement of indigenous peoples and local communities in the implementation of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework. Some submissions suggested that the participation of indigenous peoples and local communities could be encouraged through renewed efforts to implement Article 8(j). Others suggested that issues related to indigenous peoples and local communities should be integrated across all strategies under the Convention and treated more as a cross-cutting issue. It was also suggested that an integrated United Nations work programme and Inter-Agency Liaison Group on indigenous and local knowledge could be established to help support the implementation of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework and other related processes. Relatedly, it was also suggested that an advisory group could be established to provide guidance to the Convention on the protection of human rights and to help integrate human rights principles in the post-2020 framework.

145. A number of specific issues related to indigenous peoples and local communities that could be considered in the development and implementation of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework were also identified. These include:

- (a) Generating information in local languages and creating spaces for dialogue;
- (b) Ensuring representative decision-making and advocating for wider application of traditional knowledge;
- (c) Greater support for and improved protection of environmental human rights defenders;
- (d) Greater recognition and protection of the collective rights and responsibilities of indigenous peoples and local communities;
- (e) Greater support for community-based solutions;
- (f) Raising awareness of the value of traditional knowledge;
- (g) Greater recognition and support for community-based conservation, research and knowledge.

⁸ Protect and encourage customary use of biological resources in accordance with traditional cultural practices that are compatible with conservation or sustainable use requirements.

2. *Women and gender*

146. Some submissions noted that gender equality and the empowerment of women were necessary prerequisites to meet global development goals and that these issues should be addressed effectively in the in the post-2020 global biodiversity framework. Some suggested that this could be reflected by having an overarching principle in the post-2020 global biodiversity framework on this issue. Others suggested that specific measures, approaches and activities should be integrated throughout the framework, along with specific goals or targets related to gender and the recognition of the role, rights and participation of women. Others suggested that the issue of shared power and control of resources should be reflected across future targets. The importance of gender-responsive indicators for the post-2020 global biodiversity framework was also identified. It was also suggested that the post-2020 framework should refer, link or respond to relevant gender-related Sustainable Development Goals and targets.

147. More generally, the need for greater involvement of women in the conservation and management of biodiversity was noted. Some submissions referenced the Gender Plan of Action and suggested that it should be updated, strengthened and extended to 2030. Others pointed to the need for awareness-creating activities around women's rights, the need to promote gender-responsive approaches to biodiversity conservation and to better reflect gender in national biodiversity strategies and action plans and suggested that the post-2020 global biodiversity framework could help to support the attainment of these. The importance of further work and research to identifying gender issues and their relevance to biodiversity conservation was also noted. It was also suggested that the post-2020 global biodiversity framework should help to develop, enrich and share a gender-sensitive culture of nature, make gender a positive issue for decision makers concerned by biodiversity, promote the development and use of gender-disaggregated data, include gender sensitivity in economic decision-making related to biodiversity, and develop innovations for and by women in biodiversity.

148. As part of the process for developing the post-2020 global biodiversity framework a thematic consultation on gender was undertaken. The results of this meeting could help to further inform the consideration of this issue by the Open-Ended Working Group on the Post-2020 Global Biodiversity Framework.⁹

3. *Local and subnational authorities*

149. Several submissions noted the importance of local and subnational authorities in implementing the post 2020 global biodiversity framework and that this should be recognize in the framework. Others suggested that urban issues should be reflected in urban focused targets, metrics or indicators. It was also suggested that the post-2020 global biodiversity framework could have targets or sub-targets on the conservation of biodiversity in cities and other urban environments, and in the adoption of effective biodiversity policies and practices related to responsible production and consumption. It was also suggested that mechanisms should be established in the post-2020 framework that enables consultation with subnational and local government stakeholders and that the framework should reflect multilevel governance, cooperation and vertical integration. However, it was also noted that the post-2020 global biodiversity framework should respect existing models and mechanisms used by Parties for coordinating with subnational governments, cities and local authorities on biodiversity issues.

150. Some suggested that the Plan of Action on Subnational Governments, Cities and Other Local Authorities for Biodiversity¹⁰ could be updated and extended to cover the period from 2020-2030. It was also suggested that the Plan of Action be formalized as the official voice of subnational governments in Convention processes. Several submissions also noted the importance of having the involvement of local and subnational authorities in planning processes. This includes ensuring their participation in the development and implementation on national biodiversity strategies and action plans and national target setting, and encouraging authorities to develop local biodiversity strategies and action plans. However,

⁹ The report of the consultation is accessible from <https://www.cbd.int/meetings/GB-OM-2019-01>

¹⁰ Decision X/22.

with regard to local biodiversity strategies and action plans, it was suggested that these should be clearly positioned as being supportive of national level implementation and that their focus should be on addressing finer scale issues under their jurisdictions.

151. More generally some submissions pointed to the need for awareness raising to encourage relevant authorities to take the post-2020 global biodiversity framework into account in local development plans as well as in land use planning. The need for international and bilateral institutions, which fund projects affecting biodiversity and the attainment of the objectives of the Convention, to ensure that urban biodiversity impacts, and ecosystem services are recognized and incorporated into their programmes was also noted.

4. Civil society organizations

152. It was suggested that mechanisms should be developed to ensure that civil society organizations have greater levels of participation, including at global, regional and national consultations and meetings. Further several submissions suggested creating additional mechanisms to allow for the meaningful participation of civil society organizations in Convention processes as well as additional channels for their perspectives to be taken into account. Submissions also suggested the greater involvement of civil society organizations in process for reviewing the implementation of the Convention and a greater role for their in reviewing national reports were needed. One suggestion to support the greater involvement of civil society was the creation of an advisory group to further explore how non-Parties especially can participate and contribute in more effective ways. Specifically, with regard to the post-2020 global biodiversity framework it was suggested that there should be recognition of the role that citizen science programmes can play in supporting implementation.

5. Youth

153. It was suggested that the Global Youth Biodiversity Network should be closely involved in the development and implementation of the post-2020 framework. Further, several submissions identified various means of encouraging and supporting the greater involvement of youth in the development and implementation of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework. These suggestions include:

- (a) Developing a strategy for youth engagement;
- (b) Allowing youth to be represented in Party and stakeholder delegations;
- (c) Involving youth in national coordination mechanisms for the development and implementation of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework;
- (d) Creating a youth forum;
- (e) Including biodiversity education in formal curricula and other educational programmes;
- (f) Supporting citizen science initiatives, particularly for youth audiences;
- (g) Inviting UNESCO and UNICEF to strengthen the integration of biodiversity in their respective frameworks.

6. Private sector

154. A number of submissions noted that the private sector needs to be more explicitly involved in the implementation of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework. Some noted that they needed to be more involved in the development of the strategy, and that this involvement should be greater than only inviting them to participate in relevant consultations and meetings. Specific suggestions for encouraging their participation were:

- (a) The creation of prizes to acknowledge and reward action;
- (b) Supporting and further developing the Global Partnership for Business and Biodiversity;

- (c) Encouraging their involvement in the Action Agenda and in voluntary biodiversity commitments;
- (d) Providing more information on the values of nature;
- (e) Promoting the development of environmental risk mapping and stress testing tools;
- (f) Actively engaging the private sector in the developing of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework, including in the formulation of targets.

155. While there was general support for the private sector being involved in the development and implementation of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework, several submissions also raised concerns. Some of the concerns raised were the potential for “greenwashing” and the need avoid conflicts of interest. However, some submissions also suggested that these concerns could be mitigated by ensuring proper oversight, transparency and that regulations are in place.

7. *Summary*

156. There was general support for having the post-2020 global biodiversity framework developed and implemented in a participative matter. Submissions noted that all stakeholders, including indigenous peoples and local communities, women, youth, subnational and local authorities, civil society and the private sector, will need to be involved in the post-2020 global biodiversity framework if it is to be successful. Many submissions also pointed to the enabling role that stakeholders can play in implementation. There also appears to be support for reflecting traditional knowledge and gender issues in targets or sub-targets in the future programme. However, there were also suggestions that these should be treated in an over-arching or cross-cutting manner.

Q. Communication and outreach

157. Decision 14/34 specifies that the post-2020 framework should be supported by a coherent, comprehensive and innovative communication strategy. In addition, the need for effective, coherent, comprehensive and targeted communication, both during the development of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework and after its adoption, as well as the importance of ensuring that the framework can be easily communicated, were noted in many earlier submissions.

158. With regard to the form of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework, a few submissions suggested that there should be a specific target related to public awareness. Some suggested that Aichi Target 1 on awareness raising remained relevant and that more specific actions or milestones for Parties could be developed. Other submissions noted that communication was an important enabling element for the post-2020 global biodiversity framework.

159. Some submissions also suggested that the post-2020 global biodiversity framework should be accompanied by a slogan. Some specific suggestions were:

- (a) Save Life on Earth Now / tomorrow will be too late;
- (b) If we do not come together as a global community to establish an ambitious framework to protect nature after 2020, we risk losing the planet.

160. Many of the recent submissions highlighted the importance of communication in the implementation of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework. Various approaches, including making greater use of mass media, the integration of biodiversity into school curricula, developing messages for specific target groups rather than for a general audience, and encouraging partner organizations to help amplify messages were suggested as possible elements of a communication activities. Others pointed to the importance of specific events, including the high-level biodiversity Summit of Heads of States, and the UN Secretary General’s Climate Summit in September 2019, as a means of generating a global discourse on the importance of biodiversity. Others noted the importance of the Sharm El-Sheikh to Kunming Action Agenda for Nature and People. Some submissions also referred to the importance of

creating a “Paris-like” moment for biodiversity and drew parallels to the progress made on raising awareness of the importance of addressing climate change.

161. Several submissions suggested that a communication strategy for the post-2020 global biodiversity framework could be established and that the informal advisory committee on communication, education and public awareness should be involved. Suggestions for such a strategy include that it be comprehensive and reach all stakeholders. However, it was also suggested that the attention should be on reaching specific groups, including those in the economic and the journalism sectors. Several submissions suggested that the communication strategy should have clear and simple messages, and that it be developed in cooperation with experts from other biodiversity related conventions, international organizations and United Nations agencies, and other relevant organizations. Some submissions suggested that the strategy should cover a 10-year period, be accompanied with SMART targets and milestones, have supporting tools and highlight the importance of communication, education and public awareness to the post-2020 global biodiversity framework. It was also suggested that the strategy should be rooted in the future set of biodiversity targets. It was also suggested that the strategy should link to other relevant processes, such as the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development, and illustrate the relevance of biodiversity to these. Others suggested that the Convention’s current communication strategy could serve as a starting point for a future strategy. The importance of starting to implement a communication strategy in the lead-up to the fifteenth meeting of the Conference of the Parties was noted and, in this light, it was suggested that the strategy should raise awareness of the development of the plan as well as of its importance, function and shape.

162. While there was generally support for the development of a communication strategy, it was noted that a strategy alone will not be sufficient and that increased efforts from Parties and stakeholders at all levels will be needed to increase awareness. For example, one submissions pointed to the important role that could be played by zoos and botanical gardens in raising awareness. It was also suggested that partnerships with organizations and national entities be established to help to amplify messages and to help tailor messages to local contexts. The role of the Secretariat of the Convention on Biological Diversity in scaling up the work of these different actors was noted.

163. Several submissions identified more general approaches related to communication. Some suggested the need to enhance people’s connectedness with nature and their ability to take action. Others noted the importance of using social media, developing online visualization of biodiversity information, such as indicators, and shifting towards the concept of communication, empowerment, participation and advocacy. Other submissions identified specific issues that should be better communicated, including:

- (a) The links between biodiversity and human health;
- (b) The impacts of biodiversity loss on peoples and communities;
- (c) The multiple values of biodiversity;
- (d) The meanings of biodiversity, ecosystems and ecosystem functions and services.

Summary

164. Most submissions highlighted the importance of communication to the development and implementation of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework. There appears to be general support for a specific target related to the communication and awareness in the post-2020 global biodiversity as well as for an emphasis on the enabling role of communication. There also appears to be the general support for a comprehensive communication strategy related to the post-2020 global biodiversity framework.

*Annex***PROPOSALS FOR SPECIFIC TARGET WORDING**

1. By 2030, ensure that women and girls are an active part of decision-making on biodiversity management and stewardship and benefit equally from biodiversity and ecosystem services.
2. By 2030, all terrestrial and marine habitats have reached degradation neutrality, and further land and coastal habitat conversion has been halted.
3. At least 30 per cent fully or highly protected areas to be established by 2030.
4. The value of all sites of global significance for biodiversity, including key biodiversity areas, is documented, retained, and restored through protected areas and other area-based conservation measures.
5. A minimum of 30 per cent of terrestrial and marine habitat to be effectively conserved through context-appropriate, area-based conservation measures by 2030.
6. By 2030, the value of ecosystem integrity is prioritized, and, at a minimum, 2020 levels of ecological intactness are maintained or enhanced across all ecosystems, with a particular emphasis on maintaining the most intact areas.
7. By 2030, Parties have established and implemented, or supported the establishment and implementation of, plans to demonstrably maintain the function and integrity of the planet's most irreplaceable, intact and functional coral reef ecosystems by retaining at least 10 per cent live coral cover and at least 500 kg/ha reef fish biomass.
8. Put in place, by 2030, regulatory and other policy frameworks that ensure a 100 per cent divestment from activities that cause ecosystem destruction and lead to perverse incentives towards biodiversity destruction and loss.
9. No more outbreaks due to anthropogenic ecosystem changes that also lead to biodiversity loss.
10. Utilization of biodiversity and ecosystem resilience for disaster risk reduction.
11. Avoiding health and economic burden due to environmentally linked disease epidemics.
12. Countries should quantify net contributions of biodiversity to human health and well-being.
13. Conduct investigations and implement control measures on all wild animal and plant disease outbreaks to identify and control threats to biodiversity where anthropogenic change is the driver.
14. By 2030 at least 30 per cent of Earth be covered by well-connected systems of protected areas and other effective area-based conservation measures (OECMs), and managed, where appropriate, as ecological networks.
15. Effectively conserve at least 30 per cent of land and sea to conserve biodiversity.
16. Ensure the conservation of biodiversity, further expansion of protected areas and OECMs should take place in sites important for biodiversity such as Key Biodiversity Areas.
17. By 2030, ensure the respect, protection and fulfilment of the (human) right to healthy, clean, safe and sustainable environment and its ecosystems for present and future generations, through effective laws, policies and institutions implementing the three CBD objectives, including full and meaningful participation in decision-making and access to information and justice, in compliance with international human rights law and standards.
18. Protecting at least 30 per cent of the planet by 2030.
19. Reduce the pressure of illegal and unsustainable trade in wild flora and fauna on biodiversity, and enhance the benefits to wildlife conservation and human well-being that derive from legal wildlife trade at sustainable levels.

20. Illegal trade in elephant, rhino and tiger products reduced by 50 per cent.
 21. Unauthorized timber exports reduced by 50 per cent or more from countries with significant illegal trade from high conservation value forests.
 22. Risk of overexploitation reduced by 30 per cent for “high risk” shark species in trade.
 23. Best practice guidelines (e.g. the FairWild Standard recognized by the CBD’s Global Strategy for Plant Conservation) applied to trade in 50 priority wild plant value chains.
 24. Robust traceability mechanisms established for high risk wild species in trade.
 25. Eliminate species extinction risks elevated by human activities.
 26. Improve the extinction risk of all species to natural or background rates.
 27. Reduce the risk of collapse of all ecosystems to background rates.
 28. All Parties possess and maintain the regulatory framework and the capacity to regulate, manage or control the risks associated with the use and release of living modified organisms which are likely to have adverse environmental impacts that could affect the conservation and sustainable use of biological diversity, taking also into account the risks to human health.
 29. Ending degradation, fragmentation and loss of primary ecosystems, combined with very ambitious ecological restoration targets.
-