



Convention on Biological Diversity

Distr.
GENERAL

CBD/SBI/2/INF/35
21 June 2018

ENGLISH ONLY

SUBSIDIARY BODY ON IMPLEMENTATION

Second meeting

Montreal, Canada, 9-13 July 2018

Item 16 of the provisional agenda*

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY OF THE REPORT OF THE SECOND BOGIS-BOSSEY DIALOGUE FOR BIODIVERSITY

Note by the Executive Secretary

INTRODUCTION

1. At its fifteenth meeting in Beijing in 2020, the 196 Parties to the Convention on Biological Diversity are due to adopt a post-2020 global framework for biodiversity. Building on the current Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020,¹ the post-2020 global framework is expected to provide a framework or “New Deal for Nature” for the entire international community to address the underlying pressures and challenge of biodiversity and ecosystem loss and to ensure that the solutions and benefits nature provides are integrated in systemic, inclusive, and transformative actions to benefit human well-being, the economy, and the planet.

2. With the adoption of the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development and the Sustainable Development Goals,² and decisions of the Conference of the Parties, the Convention has recognized that the lead-up to 2020 and beyond requires urgent transformational change in the approaches taken to safeguard, restore, and invest in biodiversity. This urgency includes changes in behaviour at the levels of producers, consumers, Governments, and businesses; a deeper understanding, based on scientific evidence, of the factors, motivations and levers that can facilitate such transformational change; and innovation in the means of implementation.

3. At the twenty-first meeting of the Subsidiary Body on Scientific, Technical and Technological Advice (SBSTTA21),³ held in Montreal, Canada, in December 2017, Parties noted that governments and international institutions could play leading roles in establishing an enabling environment to foster positive change. To this end, further work is required, not only to identify the ways and means to facilitate transformational change for the biodiversity regime at different levels, but to examine what the Convention and the post-2020 global biodiversity framework require to leverage such change.

4. Through an inclusive and participatory road map for the post-2020 framework,⁴ consisting of a broad and transparent consultative process, the Convention is collating inputs from all stakeholders across government, civil society and business. The road to 2020 will require biodiversity champions to inspire new narratives and leverage the niches and levers that can accelerate change, as well as catalysing innovative solutions within the next three years. This will require communicating the risks and costs of

* [CBD/SBI/2/1](#).

¹ <https://www.cbd.int/sp/>

² <https://www.un.org/sustainabledevelopment/sustainable-development-goals/>

³ <https://www.cbd.int/meetings/SBSTTA-21>

⁴ <https://www.cbd.int/cooperation/bogis/S73.pdf>

inaction and the benefits of investing in biodiversity to all stakeholders across government, civil society, and business.

5. Building on the momentum and outputs of the First Dialogue on Transformative Change for Biodiversity, held in Bogis-Bossey, Switzerland, from 14 to 16 November 2017 (also referred to as the First Bogis-Bossey Dialogue for Biodiversity), and the participatory road map for the post-2020 framework, the Secretariat of the Convention convened the Second Dialogue from 4-6 March 2018, with the generous support of the Government of Switzerland. The objectives of the Dialogue were as follows:

(a) Identify enablers, including motivations and opportunities, for Parties to leverage such transformational change;

(b) Provide an outline of key areas of transformational change for the Convention in the short term (2020), medium term (2030) and long term (2050) in order to advance pathways for the acceleration of sustainability transitions in the biodiversity agenda;

(c) Set goals for further analyses of what “transition” and “transformation” mean in the biodiversity regime to complement consultations on the preparations for the post-2020 global biodiversity framework.

6. The second Dialogue brought together over 50 participants, including members of the Bureau of the Convention’s fourteenth Conference of the Parties, representatives of past presidencies of the Conference of the Parties, and a limited number of government experts, as well as experts from other biodiversity-related conventions, relevant United Nations organizations, and other stakeholder representatives involved in the work of the Convention.

7. Section I below provides a synthesized summary of the report of the Dialogue. It also introduces the perspective of sustainability transitions research as a starting point for a strategic examination of pathways for action. Section II highlights next steps in the process, including pathways for the acceleration of sustainability transitions in the biodiversity agenda. It also notes the development of a notification to Parties outlining key elements of transformational change to achieve the 2050 Vision of the Convention.

I. THE SECOND BOGIS-BOSSEY DIALOGUE FOR BIODIVERSITY

8. The Second Bogis-Bossey Dialogue for Biodiversity was held from 4 to 6 March 2018. Below is the summary of the seven sessions, which featured discussions around systems thinking and transition management in the context of the Convention on Biological Diversity.

A. Framing and setting the scene

9. *Session 1* welcomed participants and provided context on the state of global biodiversity and decisions of the twenty-first meeting of the Convention’s Subsidiary Body on Scientific, Technical, and Technological Advice (SBSTTA 21). The importance of the year 2018 for the Convention on Biological Diversity was referenced, as 2018 marks 25 years since the Convention entered into force. It is also a key milestone for the process, with the convening of the fourteenth meeting of the Conference of the Parties in Egypt, which will lead to the fifteenth meeting in China in 2020. Despite strong momentum and successes over the past 25 years, the Convention and its constituencies and partners have been unable to change the underlying trajectory of biodiversity loss and ecosystem degradation. The World Economic Forum’s *Global Risk Report*⁵ was cited as an example of how economic analysis identifies environmental risk events as likely and highly impactful risks in 2018, with political, economic, and private sector impacts.

10. It was reported that SBSTTA 21 showed new levels of interest from Parties in the concept of transformational change. This concept was introduced at the First Bogis-Bossey Dialogue for Biodiversity, in November 2017, to shift the paradigm of biodiversity loss. As Parties look towards the fifteenth meeting of the Conference of the Parties, where negotiations will focus on the post-2020 global biodiversity framework, there is an opportunity to facilitate transformational shifts. However, just agreeing on a post-2020 global biodiversity framework will not be enough. The targets set must translate

⁵ <https://www.weforum.org/reports/the-global-risks-report-2018>

into clear and meaningful action, with strategic engagement across a whole-of-government approach to meet twenty-first century sustainable development challenges.

11. The session also noted that importance of public and civic engagement. Many participants expressed concern that the public does not recognize the biodiversity crisis because it is rooted in the slow erosion of natural capital rather than a single catastrophic event. Likewise, the severity of the problem is difficult to communicate to politicians due to the mismatch in timescale between political terms and long-term impacts of biodiversity decline. Participants identified a clear need to work with multisectoral partners to better communicate the importance of biodiversity to the general public and to policymakers.

12. Some participants expressed initial unease around the idea of transitions, highlighting that discussing transitions and implementing them on the ground are two very different things. They emphasized that 2020 cannot be seen as an end goal, but, rather, as a milestone towards 2050. Highlighting the implementation gap between international policy, national policy, and change on the ground, they called for national commitments in 2018 and 2019 that provide inputs for the post-2020 framework. Participants noted the importance of taking into account differences among countries and building solutions from local to international scale in order to truly transform the approach to biodiversity. Without mobilizing action at multiple scales towards the post-2020 agenda, the change needed for 2020 and for the period beyond will not be created.

B. Systems approaches and transitions research for transformational change

13. *Session 2* provided the theoretical framework for the dialogue, introducing the concepts of transitions research and transformational change. A presentation by the [Dutch Research Institute for Transitions](#) introduced the concept of transition as a process of structural, non-linear systemic change specific to national contexts. It was stressed that global transition is already happening, spurred by global ecological crises and geopolitical conflicts, internal tension in traditional economic sectors, and global diffusion of alternative social and technological innovations. Society cannot prevent this transition to a new global norm; however, society can guide the outcome of this transition so that it is positive rather than disastrous for planet, societies and economies.

14. It was noted that, within the broader global transition, there is a biodiversity transition taking place in the way biodiversity conservation and sustainable use is understood, organized and practised. Thus far, this transition lacks a clear guiding mission and pathway to institutionalize practices, culture, and structures that support a sustainable economy. It was proposed that the Convention on Biological Diversity could facilitate this transition by: (a) bringing scientific knowledge to Parties in order to identify transition potentials; (b) supporting the development of national and sectoral transition strategies; (c) synthesizing national ambitions and implementation agendas; and (e) bringing in new methods, processes and expertise.

15. Two case studies showed how transition has taken place in government and intergovernmental processes. The Government of Peru emphasized three factors that were important for transformational change in government processes: (a) constructing a shared vision across government ministries and sectors; (b) engaging the population through novel methods, such as gastronomy; and (c) using an ecosystem service-centric approach. A presentation from the Secretariat of the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC) highlighted a key factor in fostering transformation in UNFCCC: focusing on necessity – what must be done to survive – rather than feasibility – determined by what has been achieved in the past. The Paris Agreement aimed for necessity; it aimed for the “impossible” that the world had never seen. Other key shifts included accepting that to address climate change requires fundamental shifts in existing systems, focusing on what to do rather than what not to do, capitalizing on key moments, such as the [Secretary-General’s Climate Summit in 2014](#),⁶ and shifting language to focus on how climate change manifests at local scales.

⁶ <http://www.un.org/climatechange/summit/index.html>

16. Participants identified several different factors that prevent fundamental change in the biodiversity agenda, including: (a) the lag between policy, implementation, and change on the ground; (b) misalignment of policies across institutions; (c) resistance to change; and (d) focus on rights instead of responsibilities. They likewise reflected that action tends to focus on the symptoms of biodiversity loss rather than the root causes. Symptoms can often be addressed at the national or local levels, providing a clear pathway for action; in contrast, causes may go beyond national boundaries, take longer to address, and require increased investment. The complexity inherent to addressing these root causes is therefore a strong deterrent.

17. With a view to promoting transformational change in the biodiversity agenda, participants highlighted the need for strategic multilateral and stakeholder engagement, government champions for the biodiversity agenda, enhanced accountability for non-State actors, and an improved science-policy interface. They emphasized the importance of translating global-scale good practices and technologies into the national context to enhance efficacy, sustainability and longevity.

C. Discussions on transitions research for transformational change

18. *A continuation of Session 2* engaged participants to work in round tables to discuss questions based on the model of transitions and transformational change introduced in the beginning of the session. Framing emphasized that, within the context of rapid global change, the strategies and processes the biodiversity community is employing are not sufficient. Existing issues include the fact that the biodiversity community has many plans, but not enough are operationalized; it has many targets but lacks the ability to reach or communicate them effectively; and it lacks a narrative with the power to inspire action. Additional issues include: (a) the need for stronger engagement of key political and economic actors; (b) a functional science-policy interface; and (c) effective alignment with sectors such as agriculture, fisheries, forestry, energy, mining, infrastructure, and manufacturing. At the same time, governments, United Nations agencies, non-governmental organizations, civil society, indigenous peoples and local communities, and business sector stakeholders engaged in biodiversity conservation have not yet found a way to capitalize on the synergies across their bodies of work in order to come together for maximum impact.

19. Discussion in round tables addressed how transformation could be achieved in the biodiversity agenda. Participants suggested that sustainability transitions in the Convention processes should include shifting to a limited number of overarching, positive targets that frame the message and inspire action. They also discussed approaches to enhancing mechanisms for strategic engagement of other related government agencies and non-State actors to the Convention, and suggested following the model of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) and UNFCCC to present data from the Intergovernmental Science-Policy Platform on Biodiversity and Ecosystem Services (IPBES) as a credible and robust source of information rather than “advice” to SBSTTA. Further, using a model such as the United Nations High-level Political Forum, suggestions were made to celebrate successes and best practices and to leverage attention, through the national voluntary reports, on opportunities and solutions provided by nature.

20. Participants likewise contended that the biodiversity community needs one key, overarching narrative that can form an umbrella for narratives directed at different segments of the public. Discussions further highlighted that new technological innovations could be a key tool for facilitating shifts towards new pathways for government, the private sector and civil society.

D. Strategic engagement and partnerships for biodiversity

21. *Session 3* enabled participants to explore the role of strategic engagement and public-private partnerships to provide out-of-the-box approaches to transform the biodiversity agenda.

22. Drawing on examples from the [Tropical Forest Alliance](#), it was contended that the creation of informal multi-stakeholder alliances, along with the political visibility provided by specific events, could create a mechanism for transformational change following key shifts in the international discourse and

priorities. The [Tropical Forest Alliance](#) emerged in 2010 to address deforestation in supply chains by 2020. It was not created because of United Nations or government policy decisions, but brought together diverse groups to contribute to the delivery of international agreements and targets. In 2014, the Secretary General's Climate Action Summit and the release of the [New York Declaration on Forests](#)⁷ provided political signals for the action mobilized by the [Tropical Forest Alliance](#).

23. Several factors imperative to open new pathways for change were also highlighted:

(a) Action by an imprimatur – such as the Convention on Biological Diversity, the UNFCCC, or the United Nations General Assembly – to create political mandate by inviting action within a given timeframe;

(b) Identification by the imprimatur of five to seven “tracks” in which people can engage that will deliver for heads of State and CEOs by making the economy stronger, mobilizing new finance, and catalysing innovation;

(c) A “forcing function” such as the [Tropical Forest Alliance](#) outside of the formal process that is framed as complementary, supportive, and buttressing of the formal process to engage surprising champions from the private sector, investors, innovators, and civil society;

(d) A commitment to let the movement “snowball” and gain momentum in a way that generates confidence for additional actors to take bold steps.

24. Participants discussed how strategic partnerships in three key areas could catalyse shifts in the biodiversity agenda: (a) partnerships with business and the financial sector; (b) interdepartmental partnerships; and (c) intersectoral partnerships. With regard to private sector partnerships, participants identified a need for the Convention on Biological Diversity to identify key entry points for businesses to take action, highlighting how these entry points mitigate risk and create business opportunities. Supportive tools for business partnership development were also identified including innovative finance for nature, natural capital accounting, valuation of ecosystem services, sectorial metrics to identify key parameters, sector-specific safeguards, and global policies to stimulate investments.

25. In order to facilitate interdepartmental partnerships, participants highlighted several approaches to catalyse action at both the national and international levels. At the national level, they identified the importance of informal discussion bodies, task forces, inter-ministerial platforms, and high-level political commitments. At the international level, they emphasized the need for limiting the number of biodiversity targets and the need for commitments from non-State actors in addition to State actors.

26. Addressing partnerships to facilitate transition networks across sectors, participants identified the importance of starting with institutional and stakeholder mapping to understand the drivers of biodiversity loss as well as the power dynamics of the system. Only with this information at hand, they contended, can the biodiversity community successfully identify key actors or actions to increase the likelihood of facilitating sustainability transitions.

E. Societal and disruptive technological niches influencing biodiversity

27. **Session 4** focused on how the fourth industrial revolution can be harnessed for nature. Experts argue that we have now entered the fourth industrial revolution, an era characterized by multiple different technologies that are being created at an incredible speed and scale, with a wide range of associated opportunities and risks. Technologies driving the fourth industrial revolution include the rise of artificial intelligence, machine learning, quantum coupling, virtual/artificial reality, biotechnology, and material science.

28. The biodiversity community has the potential to utilize these new technologies to ensure the conservation and sustainable use of nature. In agriculture, technological innovations include precision agriculture, robotically operated farms, and [AeroFarms](#) that germinate seeds in the air with a mist of nutrients. To enhance ecosystem restoration, drones can reforest, replant and restore terrestrial ecosystems

⁷ <https://nydfglobalplatform.org/>

whereas scientific studies of “super corals” have the potential to reduce coral die-off and restore healthy ocean ecosystem functioning. Finally, satellite and geo-tagged data as well as virtual reality can provide a critical mechanism to give a bigger picture of nature, and communicate a powerful story of humanity’s impacts on nature over time.

29. This technological change is happening at rapid rates. Therefore, it is imperative to better understand it, utilize it, and channel it to better prepare societies for the future and to better safeguard the Earth. It was suggested that because the speed of change in technology is at odds with the slow institutional process of change, it is essential that the biodiversity community begins to think about the implications of these shifts now. Participants suggested that the Convention on Biological Diversity needs to be well ahead of the governance challenges associated with technological development in order to mitigate the negative impacts and accelerate the positive. It will likewise be necessary to consider how the biodiversity community can engage consumers and citizens to utilize these technologies in a way that promotes sustainability transitions.

30. Participants highlighted the gap between the sophisticated technologies referenced and reality for rural farmers on the ground. The opportunities provided by these technologies are not equal, and there is a need to discuss how we can ensure that new technologies are used for the global public good. Discussion likewise questioned the Western paradigm of thinking that technology solves problems, and advocated for nature-based solutions such as agroecology over increased mechanization of agriculture, or halting deforestation over geoengineering solutions for carbon sequestration. Participants emphasized that with any technology there are unexpected impacts, therefore any new technology adopted at wide scales will have wide impacts. To address the fourth industrial revolution, it was recommended that the post-2020 framework include: (1) a focus on sustainable consumption and production rather than a sole promotion of technological solutions; (2) assurance to key stakeholder groups that technological change will be equitably distributed; and (3) collaboration with other sectors to identify mutual threats and opportunities.

F. Shaping and communicating more powerful narratives for biodiversity

31. *Session 5* enabled participants to reflect on a vision for communicating biodiversity and methods for communicating with diverse stakeholders. Data was shared on the prevalence of climate change and biodiversity in the media over the past 25 years⁸ that shows a clear trend towards increased references to climate change while biodiversity remains on the margins. In attempt to explain this discrepancy, presentations identified areas where biodiversity communications have fallen short in the past.

32. Among the areas highlighted was the use of the term “biodiversity”: the general public understands “forests”, “oceans”, “nature”, but they don’t understand “biodiversity”. The term is too abstract, and it loses meaning when translated to other languages. To mobilize a global movement, language and communication strategies need to be open source and customizable to unique national and local contexts. Another shortcoming identified was the traditional negative focus of communications strategies on topics such as the sixth extinction or earth system collapse; this negative messaging leads to anxiety and paralysis rather than action. Instead, communication strategies should clearly emphasize that behavioral change at the individual and institutional level across sectors can contribute to the solution. Finally, a clear strategy to engage and inspire heads of State and government to take action is needed.

33. In response to these presentations, participants considered a series of themes in roundtables. They were asked to use “backcasting” to move from long-term ambition to short-term action by: (1) describing vision and ambitions, (2) creating a pathway with stepping stones, and (3) formulating concrete actions for the next two years. Roundtables focused on four key themes: (a) shaping narrative and messages for different audiences; (b) mobilizing society to connect to nature; (c) branding for impactful communications; and (d) engaging political leaders and heads of government.

34. To shape the narrative and messages for different audiences, participants recommended working with particular sectors by demonstrating their impacts and dependencies on biodiversity, drawing on work

⁸ <https://www.cbd.int/cooperation/bogis/2018/BCCMedia.pdf>

such as that done by the [Natural Capital Coalition](#). To reach the general public, participants recommended, for example, communicating the essential links between nature and food, water and health.

35. With regard to mobilizing society to connect to nature, participants identified several pathways including: mainstreaming environment into education, creating moments where people can fall in love with nature, ensuring bold mainstreaming, building communication campaigns with positive messages across sectors that emphasize their dependency on nature, implementing a functional environmental justice regime, developing positive incentive regimes for all sectors to safeguard nature, and creating a regime where every politician needs to consider environment as an integral part of decisions taken.

36. Addressing branding for impactful communications, participants stressed the importance of different communications to target different stakeholder groups and different countries and regions. They likewise highlighted that “Convention on Biological Diversity” is long and difficult to translate, advocating for alternative taglines such as: “CBD: The Nature Convention” or “CBD: Working for Life on Earth”. They also recommended that new targets be called the “Nature Goals”. Finally, in order to measure progress participants highlighted the need for milestones in the lead-up to COP 15 in 2020 and to the 2030 target date for achievement of the Sustainable Development Goals.

37. Participants emphasized the importance of political events and high-level political champions to advance the biodiversity agenda. COP Presidencies in particular have traditionally played an important role in Convention on Biological Diversity processes by campaigning for key decisions. Germany served as a key champion to advance biodiversity financing mechanisms at COP 9, as did Japan with the 2011-2020 Strategic Plan for Biodiversity at COP 10. Discussions highlighted the importance of giving political leaders a forum outside of the formal COP processes to discuss their achievements and intentions on the global stage. It was also noted that opportunism can play a critical role by enabling the biodiversity community to utilize connections, frame biodiversity as relevant to other key issues, and capitalize on shifting political tides.

G. Transformational change for the Convention

38. *Session 6* focused on how transformation change could be leveraged for the Convention. Drawing on feedback provided during the Second Bogis-Bossey Dialogue for Biodiversity, participants applied a back-casting approach to adapt the long-term 2050 vision of the Convention “Living in Harmony with Nature” into short-term actions that describe the ambition and vision for the post-2020 global biodiversity framework. To this end, participants recognized the importance of identifying critical pathways to facilitate concrete actions over the next 30 years. As a result, participants suggested that the ambition to 2050 could be framed under the rubric “United Nature 2050”, for the international community to speak with one voice on nature, in alignment with the Sustainable Development Goals and the Paris Agreement, along with science-based targets for an ambitious and aspirational strategy to catalyse change.

39. United Nature 2050 could promote the connections between our Earth and our Humanity by proposing that half the Earth⁹ be managed for restoration and conservation - “Half Earth” (HE) and the other half to be managed for sustainable use, including transformative economic and business models and mainstreaming biodiversity into key sectors, thus resulting in a “Sustainable Half Earth” (SHE). Together, these halves will comprise a healthy, “Whole Earth” (WE). Through this equation, the goal of “Safeguarding Life on Earth” is captured in the following slogan that could resonate with different stakeholders:

Half Earth + Sustainable Half Earth = Whole Earth

HE + SHE = WE

Connect to Earth = Connect to Humanity

⁹ Drawing on American ecologist E. O. Wilson’s notion of “[half Earth](#)”: the idea that if we want to conserve the ecosystem services needed for human well-being, then half the Earth needs to be put into some form of conservation.

40. It was suggested that the United Nature 2050 rubric could also include a Nature Action Agenda 2050, a pathway to 2050 that enables Parties and other stakeholders to create the needed paradigm shift in their relationship to nature. The Nature Action Agenda 2050 would build on the elements of the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020, including the 20 Aichi Biodiversity Targets, to advance the degree, scale and rate of ambition for conservation, restoration and transformational actions. This vision for the future must be pragmatic and realistic, taking into account limits affecting Parties and the Secretariat. Key aspects would include:

(a) Creating decadal Nature Action Agendas for the periods 2020-2030, 2030-2040, and 2040-2050 and adapting them as time passes, allowing for flexible, adaptive change that accounts for regional or ecosystemic differences.

(b) Reducing the number of targets to provide clear prioritization, reduce national policy and reporting burdens, and enable clearer communication with the general public.

(c) Encouraging voluntary stocktaking, such as is done for the Sustainable Development Goals at the High-level Political Forum, to provide a forum for champions to step forward and share their accomplishments every five years.

(d) Ensuring that the funding and implementation burden does not fall solely on governments by engaging and holding accountable diverse stakeholders in the vision and process to 2050; stakeholders' actions at national level could contribute to the implementation of the national targets, thus sharing the burden with governments.

(e) Capitalizing on the convening power of the Secretariat, and mobilizing key allies in other sectors, to create a multi-stakeholder United Nature Alliance that complements government action and works towards national Nature Goals.

(f) Creating an innovative financial mechanism that supports the implementation of the post-2020 framework by creatively blending public, private funds and impact investments to ensure adequate mobilization of resources. Such a mechanism could constitute a "Nature Fund".

41. To advance the United Nature 2050 agenda and catalyse transformative change for the Convention, participants suggested several pathways around (a) setting objectives and targets; (b) enhancing accountability, transparency, and implementation; (c) improving the Convention bodies' working methods; and (d) the role of the Secretariat in supporting transformation.

42. With regards to setting objectives and targets, participants advocated building on existing targets and tools. They also suggested that ambitious, positively-worded targets give confidence, and enable aspirational thinking and action. Discussion likewise advocated for increased flexibility in targets to adequately reflect national and regional circumstances. Finally, the need for indicators that are accessible and easy to work with was emphasized.

43. In addressing accountability, transparency, and implementation, participants proposed that soft implementation mechanisms could bring people together by providing incentives through investment and financing mechanisms. In order to enhance implementation in particular, it was suggested that an accountability map be created to identify different entities and actors responsible. Because implementation has a number of inter-related elements, creating this map could be an important way both to identify synergies and to increase transparency.

44. Participants reviewing the Convention bodies' working methods presented a tailored set of concerns, including the large number of documents and decisions at COP/MOP; the increased politicization of SBSTTA; the need for a clear division of focus between SBSTTA and SBI; the need for change in modality through which the Convention engages with indigenous peoples and local communities to ensure that traditional knowledge is incorporated into decisions under the Convention; the need for indigenous peoples and local communities to be represented in working groups and delegations; the need for a different approach to the high-level segment; and the need for clear roles for forums to support broader processes under the Convention.

45. With regard to the role of Secretariat in supporting transformation, participants suggested that the Secretariat could be more proactive in proposing transformational changes and working with Parties in an iterative process to build a movement. Participants called for the Secretariat to play a critical role facilitating processes at the regional and global level, and in collecting, aggregating, and presenting views from diverse stakeholders. Discussion also highlighted the need for political engagement at the highest level by building contacts with various political leaders and identifying champions.

H. Opportunities leading to the post-2020 global biodiversity framework

46. **Session 7** provided a forum to discuss opportunities leading to the post-2020 global biodiversity framework and engaged participants to discuss the role of the Secretariat and other stakeholders moving forward. Presentations from IUCN and the Secretariat of the Convention emphasized that, although an enabling policy environment has been created through the Convention on Biological Diversity to address biodiversity loss, action needs to be accelerated and scaled-up through several discrete pathways: (a) a science-based target for 2050; (b) increased linkages between global and national-level targets; and (c) key strategies across the biodiversity community.

47. It was suggested that there is a need for an overall science-based target for biodiversity for 2050 that can be quantified and tracked through implementation, equivalent to the 2°C / 1.5°C temperature rise cap agreed under the Paris Agreement. This target should express necessity rather than feasibility, and be science-based, succinct, positively framed, bold, and quotable. To deliver by 2050, it will be important to set milestones for 2030 and 2040 as well as to connect the target to the Sustainable Development Goals and to the mission of the Convention on Biological Diversity and its 2050 Vision.

48. Addressing links between global and national-level targets, participants suggested there is a need to increase responsibility, accountability, and commitment from Parties and stakeholders for implementation and action. It was suggested that the Subsidiary Body on Implementation could serve as a forum for this.

49. With regards to key strategies across the biodiversity community, a clear need for action was identified. This could include creating a “World Action Plan on Nature”; adopting more positive rhetoric for biodiversity and the Convention; making clear, traceable links between the 2050 Vision, the mission of the Convention, and national and local level targets; aligning to the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development; creating global stock-takes to monitor and celebrate progress towards agreed targets; and creating a platform for commitments to be made by non-State actors.

50. A calendar of events relating to the development of the post-2020 framework was also presented.¹⁰ The timeline included events specific to the Convention (COPs, SBSTTA, Subsidiary Body on Implementation, etc.), high-level political engagement (UNGA, HLPF/Sustainable Development Goals, G7, G20, etc.), business and partnerships (World Bank, WEF, and OECD processes, among others), non-governmental organizations (WWF, TNC, and IUCN events, among others), and other processes and meetings (including those of CITES, Ramsar, UNCCD, UNFCCC, IPBES, FAO, IWC, and UNESCO). In the face of these diverse events, it was advocated that the Convention on Biological Diversity create a master strategy to identify 3-5 events as key milestones for instigating transformational change leading to COP 15 in 2020. With the identification of these events, the Convention on Biological Diversity and partners could then strategically engage with event organizers to plan, work towards and achieve concrete outcomes and advance a unified movement for the future of the Planet.

51. Building on these presentations, three key themes emerged during this final plenary discussion: (a) comparative roles of the Secretariat and partners as well as other stakeholders in catalysing transformative change; (b) factors necessary for national political engagement; and (3) creation of a pathway to 2020 and beyond.

52. Participants called for the Secretariat of the Convention to play a central role in crafting a broad agreement around messages, vision, and targets; in engaging with diverse stakeholders; and in mobilizing

¹⁰ <https://www.cbd.int/cooperation/bogis/2018/2020roadmap.pdf>

action. At the same time, they acknowledged that the Secretariat is compact and will require the support of relevant partners to implement a transformative vision across sectors. They recommended building on existing mechanisms that the Secretariat has used to develop support – for example, partnering with various stakeholders to take the lead on various targets – in order to identify partners to take action forward. A key challenge, participants stressed, will be to rise above inter-organizational competition to work together to meet the end goals defined by the Convention.

53. Discussing factors necessary for national political engagement, participants highlighted that within countries there is a great deal of confusion about what the international community is trying to achieve, with the Ministry of Environment discussing the Aichi Biodiversity Targets and other ministries discussing different goals and targets. Governments, they emphasized, do not want another space in which to engage; they want *the* space that will make the difference. Tying nature to the Sustainable Development Goals, and emphasizing its essential role in delivering all other Sustainable Development Goals, could be a key tool to facilitate cohesion across government and to further position the biodiversity agenda.

54. Addressing the pathway to 2020 and beyond, participants noted that momentum is already growing towards a “2020 China Moment”, with conversations occurring across the biodiversity community. With the convergence of the goals of the Tropical Forest Alliance (TFA) for 2020, the Oceans Conference in 2020, and the Paris Agreement’s stock-take in 2020, the post-2020 global biodiversity framework can provide a key “moment” to coalesce diverse political agendas. The Secretariat of the Convention, participants suggested, can play a critical role by committing to and calling for this moment to galvanize action at political and social levels. In the context of the COP, the buy-in and ownership from host countries were also noted.

II. NEXT STEPS FOR THE BOGIS-BOSSEY DIALOGUE FOR BIODIVERSITY

55. The Bogis-Bossey Dialogues came about because it is evident that we are in a biodiversity crisis, and our current instruments are not able to address it. In closing, participants called for a continuing process owned by Parties and coordinated by the Convention to adopt and integrate changes in the architecture and structure of existing policy instruments.

56. Among the next steps, the Secretariat of the Convention will follow up on the practical suggestions provided during the discussions, including dissemination of the reports from the First and Second Bogis-Bossey Dialogues on Biodiversity as information documents for SBSTTA 22 and SBI 2. A notification to Parties will distil cutting-edge ideas, concepts, and transformative actions for consideration in a succinct format for policymakers.

57. A third dialogue in the form of a seminar is planned for 8 July 2018 on the margins of the second meeting of the Subsidiary Body on Implementation to bring this information, ideas, and insights to the attention of all Parties to the Convention as well as other stakeholders and ensure transparent and equal level of information for all interested actors. The 8 July seminar will take stock of the findings of the two Dialogues and further work to identify a transformative agenda for action, with a view to contribute to preparations for a post-2020 global biodiversity framework.
