



Convention on Biological Diversity

Distr.
GENERAL

CBD/COP/14/INF/16
30 October 2018

ENGLISH ONLY

CONFERENCE OF THE PARTIES TO THE
CONVENTION ON BIOLOGICAL DIVERSITY

Fourteenth meeting
Sharm El-Sheikh, Egypt, 17-29 November 2018
Item 17 of the provisional agenda*

PRELIMINARY SYNTHESIS AND ANALYSIS OF VIEWS ON THE SCOPE AND CONTENT OF THE POST-2020 GLOBAL BIODIVERSITY FRAMEWORK

Note by the Executive Secretary

INTRODUCTION

1. The Conference of the Parties at its fifteenth meeting, in 2020, is expected to consider for adoption the post-2020 global biodiversity framework, which will be developed through a preparatory process to be agreed during the fourteenth meeting of the Conference of the Parties.¹
2. On several occasions,² Parties and observers have been invited to submit views on the process for developing the post-2020 global biodiversity framework. A number of Parties and observers used these invitations to also provide views on the structure and content of the framework. A summary of these views was made available to the Subsidiary Body on Implementation at its second meeting.³
3. At its second meeting, the Subsidiary Body on Implementation requested the Executive Secretary to invite, for submission by 15 December 2018, initial views on the aspects of the scope and content of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework, including (a) the scientific underpinning of the scale and scope of actions necessary to make progress towards the 2050 Vision and (b) a possible structure. The present document is a preliminary analysis and synthesis of the comments received by 16 October 2018.⁴ It also draws on the earlier comments received, as noted above, as well as relevant conclusions and recommendations from the twenty-first meeting of the Subsidiary Body on Scientific, Technical and Technological Advice and the second meeting of the Subsidiary Body on Implementation. It will be updated and revised in the light of any additional comments received and the discussions at the fourteenth meeting of the Conference of the Parties.
4. 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, (e) targets, (f) implementation mechanisms, (g) review processes, (h) indicators, (i) communication and outreach, and (j) gaps in the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020 that could be addressed in the post-2020 global

* CBD/COP/14/1.

¹ See CBD/COP/14/9.

² See notifications [2017-052](#) and [2017-124](#).

³ CBD/SBI/2/17, annex II.

⁴ All of the comments received on the post-2020 global biodiversity framework are accessible from <https://www.cbd.int/post2020/submissions.shtml>

biodiversity framework. The views expressed are summarized below and will be used in developing subsequent documentation related to the development of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework.

I. AMBITION OF THE POST-2020 GLOBAL BIODIVERSITY FRAMEWORK

5. A general view that has been expressed is that the post-2020 framework should be ambitious and support the transformational changes needed to realize the 2050 Vision for Biodiversity. In particular, the post-2020 global biodiversity framework should serve as a universal framework for action on biodiversity and foster strong ownership and strong support for its implementation.

II. RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN THE POST-2020 GLOBAL BIODIVERSITY FRAMEWORK, THE CURRENT STRATEGIC PLAN AND OTHER RELEVANT PROCESSES

6. A view expressed in many submissions is that the post-2020 global biodiversity framework should not be less ambitious than the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020 and that the current plan should serve as a “baseline”. Similarly, some submissions have indicated that the Aichi Biodiversity Targets should be used as a starting point for negotiating the post-2020 global biodiversity framework and that changes to these should be kept to a minimum. However, others have suggested that more significant changes are required, usually without specifying such changes or amendments.

7. Many suggest that the post-2020 global biodiversity framework should not be less ambitious than or inconsistent with the commitments, frameworks and processes established by 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 was frequently noted.

III. RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN THE CONVENTION AND THE PROTOCOLS

8. Having a post-2020 global biodiversity framework that comprehensively addresses the Cartagena and Nagoya Protocols in order to improve integration and coordinated governance, implementation, review and financing across the Convention and the Protocols has been noted. However, with regard to the Strategic Plan for the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety 2011-2020, it was noted that this plan had a different structure and content than the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020. Some recommended an approach whereby biosafety considerations would be included in the scope of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework, possibly by the inclusion of an objective or target focused on biosafety, with a specific post-2020 implementation plan for the Cartagena Protocol incorporating clear outcomes and indicators.

IV. ELEMENTS OF A POST-2020 GLOBAL BIODIVERSITY FRAMEWORK

9. In line with the conclusions of Subsidiary Body on Scientific, Technical and Technological Advice in recommendation XXI/1, many submissions noted that the 2050 Vision of the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020 is relevant and should be a part of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework. It was also suggested that the rationale for the 2050 Vision should be further developed, and the possible need for milestones for 2030 and 2040 should be explored.

10. Many submissions have suggested that the post-2020 global biodiversity framework should have an actionable mission statement. Specific suggestions on what this mission should be have been limited, but general views expressed are that it should serve as a call to action, be science-based, be framed positively, be inspirational and motivating, be short and easily communicated, and be focused on implementation. It has also been suggested that the mission statement should be time bound, with 2030 suggested as a possible end date, and serve as a stepping stone towards the 2050 Vision.

11. In addition to the 2050 Vision and the 2030 mission, there is also general support for the post-2020 global biodiversity framework having a set of biodiversity targets for the period between 2020 and 2030 as well as associated indicators. This is meant in part to align it with the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development.

12. There appears to be a general view that the issues addressed by the strategic goals of the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020 remain relevant and that these should be reflected in the post-2020 global biodiversity framework. However, some submissions also noted that changes to the strategic goals may be needed without specifying what the needed changes are. It was also suggested that, in the post-2020 period, the programmes of work of the Convention should be aligned with future biodiversity targets.

13. In addition to the specific elements of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework, it was suggested that a conceptual framework is needed to link its different elements. However, there were no specific views on what such a conceptual framework should look like.

V. TARGETS

14. Most submissions noted the need for clear targets which are easy to communicate, are rooted in science, can be easily measured and are designed to galvanize action across sectors of governments and society. Targets should also be “SMART” (specific, measurable, ambitious, realistic and time-bound). A number of submissions also noted the need for baselines for any targets as well as indicators to be able to monitor progress. It was also suggested that the targets in the post-2020 global biodiversity framework should be more integrated, that they should address all three objectives of the Convention, and that they should be focused on actions.

15. It was observed by some, that the scientific basis for targets should be enhanced, including changes to make the targets easier to assess and more streamlined in the post-2020 global biodiversity framework. Similarly, it was suggested that targets should be clear about the desired outcomes and should be adaptable for both national and subnational scales as well as different sectors. It was also suggested that targets should have both process and outcome components and that all targets should have implementation plans that include cost estimates.

16. Most of the views expressed on targets for the post-2020 global biodiversity framework focused on the general qualities of future targets. Among the few submissions that proposed specific wording for targets were the following:

- (a) Improve the survival probability of all species;
- (b) Reduce the risk of collapse of all ecosystems to background rates;
- (c) A target on the number of oceanic islands to have invasive mammals eradicated and its expected cost and benefits;
- (d) 30 per cent of the territorial waters and contiguous zones of semi-enclosed seas are protected and managed effectively;
- (e) Increase the percentage of highly protected marine areas to 30 per cent by 2030;
- (f) A target related to biosafety;
- (g) A target related to the impacts of trade;
- (h) A target related to migratory species;
- (i) A target on gender;
- (j) A target on the health problems caused by loss of biodiversity, environmental services and the new dynamics of infectious diseases;
- (k) A target on the promotion of connectivity throughout restoration;
- (l) A target on developing and implementing national marine spatial planning;
- (m) Ensure fair and equitable sharing of benefits arising from the use of genetic resources and associated traditional knowledge and promote adequate access to genetic resources and associated traditional knowledge;
- (n) By 2030, the traditional knowledge, innovations and practices of indigenous peoples and local communities relevant for the conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity, and their customary use of biological resources, are respected, subject to national legislation and relevant international

obligations, and fully integrated and reflected in the implementation of the Convention with the full and effective participation of indigenous peoples and local communities, at all relevant levels.

VI. IMPLEMENTATION MECHANISMS

17. There was general support for having a post-2020 global biodiversity framework that serves as a basis for universal action on biodiversity and which emphasizes implementation. It was also observed that, if the post-2020 global biodiversity framework remains a flexible framework to be adapted to national circumstances, there will be a need to increase the sense of responsibility, accountability and commitment to implement it.

18. The need to ensure that a post-2020 global biodiversity framework has tools to support its implementation and is appropriately resourced and linked to the resource mobilization strategy was also noted. In this respect, the need for full and effective financing from all sources was emphasized in some submissions. More generally, the need to ensure that the post-2020 global biodiversity framework is scalable and has traction and impact at all relevant levels was also noted as being an important element in ensuring its implementation.

19. Some noted that there is a mismatch between the Aichi Biodiversity Targets and the level of ambition and implementation of the national targets established by Parties in their new, revised or updated national biodiversity strategies and action plans and that this issue requires more attention in the post-2020 global biodiversity framework. It was also suggested that the enabling aspects identified in decision X/2 for the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020 should be better integrated into the post-2020 global biodiversity framework.

20. The importance of aligning a post-2020 global biodiversity framework with other international frameworks was highlighted in many submissions. In particular, the role of the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development in enhancing the enabling environment for the post-2020 global biodiversity framework was highlighted. Similarly, it was noted that aligning the post-2020 global biodiversity framework with the 2030 Agenda will help to avoid the isolation of biodiversity from other global economic and social goals and allow biodiversity to be better mainstreamed and for the post-2020 global biodiversity framework to be implemented more effectively.

VII. REVIEW PROCESSES

21. The need for an effective review process in the post-2020 global biodiversity framework to improve transparency and accountability was noted. Some suggested elements of a review process were the use of milestones, encouraging the enhanced use of existing tools and mechanisms across biodiversity-related conventions, including systems for reporting, indicators and information-sharing, national reports and national biodiversity strategies and action plans. The need for more effective and robust national reporting was noted, as was the possibility of making greater use of the voluntary peer-review process. It was also suggested that some sort of accountability or binding compliance mechanism should be explored. The need to develop mechanisms through which the private sector can fully engage and can input evidence of its approaches, experiences and good practices was also noted.

22. More generally, it was emphasized that the review process for the post-2020 global biodiversity framework should be transparent and allow for the participation of indigenous peoples and local communities, civil society organizations and other stakeholders. It was also noted that the initial rounds of voluntary national reviews considered by the High-level Political Forum on Sustainable Development could provide useful lessons for a review mechanism. It was further noted that the review mechanisms under the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change could also be a useful approach.

VIII. INDICATORS

23. The importance of identifying indicators for the different aspects for the post-2020 global biodiversity framework was noted in many submissions. Most suggested that the starting point for indicators should be the indicators developed for the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020. The need

to identify indicators as the post-2020 global biodiversity framework is developed was noted. This is to ensure that indicators are available when the framework is adopted or shortly thereafter. The possibility of developing shared biodiversity indicators for the biodiversity-related multilateral environmental agreements was also suggested.

IX. COMMUNICATION AND OUTREACH

24. The need for more effective and targeted communication, both during the development of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework and after its adoption, was noted. In this respect, the potential role of biodiversity champions or ambassadors was highlighted. However, specific communication needs and ways to address these were not identified in the submissions received to date.

X. GAPS IN THE STRATEGIC PLAN FOR BIODIVERSITY 2011-2020

25. Many submissions suggested issues that could be better reflected in the post-2020 global biodiversity framework than in the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020. Some of these are related to specific topics or themes while others are cross-cutting in nature. Furthermore, some could be addressed through the development of specific targets while others would have more general implications for the post-2020 global biodiversity framework. Most submissions were not specific on how these different issues should be reflected in the post-2020 global biodiversity framework. The issues can be organized under several general categories and include:

- (a) Ecosystems:
 - (i) Conservation and wise use of wetlands;
 - (ii) Marine areas beyond national jurisdiction;
 - (iii) Soil biodiversity;
 - (iv) Freshwater;
- (b) Species:
 - (i) Migratory species;
 - (ii) Sustainable use of terrestrial species;
 - (iii) Pollinators.
- (c) Major groups:
 - (i) Religious communities;
 - (ii) Private sector;
 - (iii) Cities;
- (d) Indirect pressures on biodiversity:
 - (i) Trade;
- (e) Solutions to biodiversity loss:
 - (i) Nature based solutions;
 - (ii) Transformative approach to conservation;
 - (iii) Conservation efforts to protect biodiversity in transboundary areas;
 - (iv) Landscape connectivity;
 - (v) Creating or expanding ecological corridors;
 - (vi) Marine spatial planning;
- (f) Implementation issues:
 - (i) Capacity-building;
 - (ii) Resource mobilization;
 - (iii) Mainstreaming;

- (g) Human wellbeing:
 - (i) Gender;
 - (ii) Cultural diversity;
 - (iii) Health;
 - (iv) Local sustainable use and consumption;
 - (v) Peace, and conflict;
 - (vi) Food security;
 - (vii) Land tenure.

26. In addition to the points listed above and as already noted in section III, several submissions expressed the need to include aspects related to biosafety and access and benefit-sharing more explicitly in the post-2020 global biodiversity framework. It was also suggested that the Global Strategy for Plant Conservation should be reviewed and integrated into the relevant sections/parts of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework.

27. While many submissions identified issues that should be reflected in the post-2020 global biodiversity framework, some submissions also cautioned against expanding the scope of the plan excessively as it could lose focus, and biodiversity issues could become less prominent. Some expressed the view that the post-2020 global biodiversity framework should focus on the overall trends and drivers of biodiversity loss.

XI. SUMMARY

28. In the submissions received to date on the post-2020 global biodiversity framework, there do not appear to be any major points of disagreement. In addition, many of the submissions are consistent with the conclusions and recommendations of the Subsidiary Body on Scientific, Technical and Technological Advice at its twenty-first meeting⁵ and the Subsidiary Body on Implementation at its second meeting⁶ on this issue. However, the majority of submissions to date have focused on general issues or concepts and have provided few specific suggestions. Based on the submissions to date, the following conclusions can be drawn:

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

(b) The post-2020 global biodiversity framework should link to and support, in a coherent and synergistic manner, other frameworks and processes which have a direct bearing on biodiversity, in particular the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development, the Paris Agreement on Climate Change and the Sendai Framework on Disaster Risk Reduction;

(c) The 2050 Vision of the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020 of “Living in Harmony with Nature by 2050” remains relevant and should be a part of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework;

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

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

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

⁵ See recommendation [XXI/1](#).

⁶ See recommendation [2/19](#).

(g) The scale and scope of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework should have a strong scientific underpinning;

(h) The post-2020 global biodiversity framework should cover the period from 2021 to 2050 and have a mission statement which is short, is inspirational and motivating, is framed positively and focuses on implementation. The mission statement should address the first decade of the post-2020 framework, namely 2021-2030, and serve as a stepping stone towards the 2050 Vision;

(i) The post-2020 global biodiversity framework should contain targets which are specific, measurable, ambitious, realistic and time-bound. These targets should be science- and evidence-based, address both desired outcomes and processes, be easy to communicate and be designed to galvanize action across governments, financial and business sectors, and all sectors of the society;

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

(k) The post-2020 global biodiversity framework should address the three objectives of the Convention as well as the objectives of the Cartagena and Nagoya Protocols (to improve integration across the Convention and Protocols). It may be supplemented by specific and more detailed implementation plans for the Protocols;

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

(m) The post-2020 global biodiversity framework should have a focus on implementation and have an effective process for monitoring and an effective review process to improve transparency and accountability. However, the specifics for accomplishing this beyond the established national reporting and voluntary peer-review process needs to be determined;

(n) The different elements of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework should be linked through a conceptual framework;

(o) The post-2020 global biodiversity framework should have a coherent and comprehensive communication and outreach action plan to promote awareness of, and effective engagement in its implementation;

(p) The post-2020 global biodiversity framework should effectively incorporate gender considerations and the perspectives of indigenous peoples and local communities;

(q) The post-2020 global biodiversity framework should have tools to support its implementation and be appropriately resourced.
