

Views expressed in Plenary on potential elements of the structure and scope of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework (agenda item 4)

CLUSTER 4 – CROSS-CUTTING APPROACHES AND ISSUES

Addressed in the afternoon of the second day of the meeting of the Working Group, statements were made on “Cluster 4” by the following Parties to the Convention: Chad speaking on behalf of Africa, Central African Republic, Norway, New Zealand, Mexico, Finland speaking on behalf of the European Union and its member States, Singapore, Sierra Leone, Nigeria, Ghana, Chile, Ecuador, Ethiopia, Belarus, Indonesia, Australia, Argentina, Malaysia, Canada, Switzerland, Peru, India, Côte d’Ivoire, Uganda, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Bolivia, Paraguay, Namibia, China, Togo, Philippines, Grenada, Colombia and Cameroon.

Statements were also made on “Cluster 4” by the following organizations: The World Bank, UNU-IAS, The Nature Conservancy, IIFB speaking on behalf of IPLCs, Global Youth Biodiversity Network, a statement on behalf of World Animal Net, Compassion in World Farming and Born Free Foundation, a statement on behalf of the International Collective in Support of Fish-workers (ICSF), Masifundise and the Traditional Fisherfolk Union of Indonesia, and a statement on behalf of the ICCA Consortium, Global Forest Coalition, Friends of the Earth International, ActionAid, World Animal Net, Natural Justice and Forest Peoples Programme.

General matters

Key points

The Conference of the Parties invited all stakeholders to actively engage and contribute to the process of developing a robust post-2020 global biodiversity framework in order to foster strong ownership of the framework to be agreed and strong support for its immediate implementation (decision 14/34, para. 6).

Important to engage cities, local and subnational authorities in the post-2020 framework.

Relevant stakeholders need to review decision X/22 on the Plan of Action on Subnational Governments, Cities and Other Local Authorities for Biodiversity 2011-2020 and develop a more ambitious plan which would enable Parties to support efforts and recognize the contribution of cities, local and subnational authorities to the post-2020 framework.

Support ICLEI’s draft 10-point framework as contribution to the post-2020 discussions on the role and contribution of cities, local and subnational authorities to the post-2020 framework.

Framework needs to have equitable distribution of costs and benefits; strategy for resource mobilization needs to be integral part of framework.

The views of indigenous people, local communities, youth and gender perspectives, should be integrated in the post-2020 framework.

Emphasize the importance of dialogue between decision makers, technicians and scientists, with citizens, subnational governments and with young people, whose role is key at the moment, as the most effective way to understand each other and support solving national priorities.

Cross-cutting issues are of equal importance and should be reflected in appropriate goals, targets and indicators;

Note: the above points to the need to add other categories, such as “stakeholder engagement”, as another element to “mainstreaming, partnerships, synergies, IPLCs, gender and youth”.

A. Mainstreaming

Areas of convergence

Many interventions supported mainstreaming of biodiversity across government, all sectors of production and society and noted its importance for transformational change. Many regard this as fundamental to the success of the global biodiversity framework. Especially important is mainstreaming biodiversity by encouraging buy-in from sectors that are heavily reliant on and have a significant impact on biodiversity. Additionally, subnational governments, cities and local authorities have broad support for mainstreaming and partnerships. Mainstreaming through broad partnerships is a common theme. Biodiversity should be mainstreamed into national plans and across sectors. Of primary importance is the mainstreaming of the Convention on Biological Diversity and its Protocols and integration into the global biodiversity framework. Mainstreaming biodiversity is an enabler to achieve transformational change. Land/seascape approaches promote sustainable long-term co-management of productive land/seascapes. Integrated approaches can allow for planners to deal with conservation and development issues concurrently. The call for ambition in the global biodiversity framework was generally supported across all the “cross-cutting issues”.

Cross-cutting in general should not imply any less significance than other elements. A general comment by a number of interventions agreed that the term “cross-cutting” did not resonate well and instead could be referred to as “implementation instruments” – tools applied for the implementation of the framework. Mainstreaming efforts should include greening of infrastructure and broad partnerships for cooperation.

Areas of divergence

Addressing mainstreaming in a cross-cutting manner or as a stand-alone target (although the majority are in favour of addressing it in a cross-cutting manner). Some called for a recognition of mainstreaming at a higher decision-making level in different sectors. Others suggested a bottom-up approach to engage all actors and create “buy-in”. Some called for a specific target on mainstreaming.

Areas proposed for amendments/refinements or requiring further development/consideration:

Various approaches to mainstreaming were suggested including as a cross-cutting issue or as a distinct target. Targets should complement the targets and actions of Conventions and processes. Mainstreaming could be enhanced through a participatory framework that leverages the efforts of all actors. Further specific sectoral guidance for mainstreaming was requested in several interventions. Some called for a clear and updated guideline on mainstreaming. The documentation of good practices for mainstreaming is recommended. Mainstreaming should be guided by environmental impact assessments, strategic environmental assessments and safeguard frameworks. Several calls were made for capacity-building for mainstreaming. Related to mainstreaming were issues of resource mobilization and sustainable financing. Concepts of natural capital should be mainstreamed across planning and development. Mainstreaming could be supported through education and training, including through partnerships with universities and the private sector. Synergies should be explored across different actors according to their respective responsibilities and roles. The planning cycles of all the relevant conventions and reporting mechanisms should be synchronized. Mainstreaming for the Convention could be bottom-up beginning with the its internal system. An important tool for mainstreaming will be the overarching communication strategy, in plain understandable language. Mainstreaming required enhanced cooperation with other MEAs in order to ensure a coherent global environmental policy and to achieve the Sustainable Development Goals. Mainstreaming will require raising awareness of the values, including the different cultural values, of biodiversity. Mainstreaming will require pathways to lifestyle change and behavioural change focused on reduced consumption both in institutions and individuals through, among other things, less energy consumption and fewer material-intensive lifestyles. Greener consumption patterns to ensure growth and development need not come at the cost of green assets/biodiversity. Investing in biodiversity should be promoted as both ecological and economic sense. Some interventions specifically mentioned the engagement of farmers in mainstreaming and as partners in the global biodiversity framework.

Mainstreaming will require creative and integral means of implementation, including more than economic measures and incentives. Multifunctional and multipurpose systems deserve special consideration when defining target and indicator for mainstreaming. Some suggested the integration of biodiversity in national accounting, as natural assets. Some mentioned the need for good environmental governance to underpin mainstreaming. A number of interventions referred to the valuing of biodiversity and the different cultural values associated with biodiversity, as incentives for conservation and sustainable use. Mainstreaming must reach the heart of decision-making at the national level for the desired impact. Capacity-building and tools are needed to facilitate mainstreaming across sectors, including innovated measures such as natural capital, biodiversity offsets and ecosystems assessments. Some references were made to the importance of the ecosystem approach for effective mainstreaming. Some called for the adoption of principles to guide decision-making, strengthen the role of indigenous peoples, women and youth. Some noted the definition of transformational change in IPBES could be applied to the Convention. Specific references were made to mainstreaming conservation and sustainable use on marine and coastal biodiversity through a sustainable ocean economy.

B. Partnerships

Areas of convergence

There is some agreement on the important role of subnational governments, cities and local authorities in the global biodiversity framework. Gains could be consolidated, and ambition increased for the global biodiversity framework. The Environmental Management Group could engage all biodiversity-related conventions and institutions, especially with regard to restoration, recalling that the period 2021 to 2030 is the United Nations Decade for Ecosystem Restoration. Many interventions highlighted the importance working with and learning from other biodiversity-related conventions and, more broadly, the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development, Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations and UNFCCC. Additionally, designation schemes advocating land/seascape approaches, such as UNESCO's "Cultural Landscapes" and "Man and the Biosphere" and FAO's Globally Important Agricultural Heritage Systems (GIAHS) could be considered, as well as initiatives such as UNCTAD's Biotrade. Several interventions noted that the Convention should work within its mandate and address cross-cutting issues with other bodies through collaboration, not duplication, and in complementarity with other mandates. The global biodiversity framework should empower a broad range of actors, including indigenous peoples and local communities, women and youth. The framework should encourage Parties to establish partnerships with policymakers at the national and subnational levels, with the private sector, civil society, farmers, research and academia and individuals as citizens and consumers, and strengthen the inclusion of indigenous peoples and local communities as well as youth and women.

Areas of divergence

Engaging the private sector remains controversial for some Parties and participants. Others believe it is essential in order to address the drivers of biodiversity loss, and that failure to engage will be detrimental to the goals and vision of the Convention. There are some different approaches to inclusion of partners, such as indigenous peoples and local communities, gender and women, youth, some calling for overarching elements, as principles, but also specific targets and indicators.

Areas proposed for amendments/refinements or requiring further development/consideration

Partnerships, including with multilateral instruments, should be built on more than common goals but on a shared path to equality, values and desire, taking into account the goals and targets of sister multilateral instruments. Integrated land/seascape approaches, such as the Satoyama Initiative, should be promoted towards the vision of societies living in harmony with nature. Land/seascape approaches could be considered under NBSAPs and are useful approaches providing a dynamic conceptual framework to understand the multifunctional nature of productive land/seascapes. Good governance and the rule of law, including human rights law, and gender equality are important principles. The roles of various actors,

indigenous peoples and local communities, women and youth need to be highly valued, clearly specified and action-oriented, enabling them to play a key role as agents of change to transform biodiversity conservation and sustainable use in the post-2020 global biodiversity framework. Effective partnerships will require investment in capacity-building, including through formal and informal education and training for the effective participation of youth, women, indigenous peoples and local communities and other marginalized groups.

C. Synergies

Convergence

Many interventions called for deep synergies between the biodiversity-related multilateral environment agreements and other relevant processes, within the mandate of the Convention, and respecting the mandates of other bodies. Many other processes, programmes and funds were mentioned, including the sustainable development agenda and UNFCCC. Many noted that NBSAPs are and should remain the main implementation instrument of the Convention. Mainstreaming biodiversity is a pathway to achieving transformational change.

Areas of divergence

-

Areas proposed for amendments/refinements or requiring further development/consideration

Synergies include a coherent, complementary and integrated common reporting framework and accountability system, particularly across the multilateral environmental agreements. The development of strong cooperation mechanisms is also suggested. Some suggested that the Environmental Management Group of UNEP could assume the coordination role. Some suggested that the NBSAPs could be revised, some encouraged continued implementation, and some called for the establishment of a broader modular NBSAP that would include the strategies of all biodiversity-related conventions, in order to guarantee a coherent and effective national biodiversity policy. Such a comprehensive tool would guarantee a coherent and effective national biodiversity policy. Synergies could be regarded as an implementation instrument and establish a structure to strengthen cooperation between relevant treaties and to develop an integrated reporting and accountability system. Synergies must include trade organizations. Synergies between nature and culture had been identified, calling for nature- and culture-based solutions to address the multiple crisis faced by humanity.

D. Indigenous peoples and local communities

Convergence

Many submissions called for an elevation of the role of indigenous peoples and local communities in the post-2020 global biodiversity framework, noting indigenous peoples and local communities are stewards and guardians of biodiversity and critical for the success of the global biodiversity framework. Some submissions also noted the importance of the knowledge, innovations and practices as well as their collection actions for conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity. Many submissions noted that the areas targeted for conservation, the remaining lands and waters high in biodiversity, are the traditional territories of indigenous peoples and local communities, as noted in the IPBES *Global Assessment*. Several interventions noted that poverty is a major cause of biodiversity loss.

Areas of divergence

Interventions proposed various strategies, some arguing against the cross-cutting approach. A number of interventions felt that cross-cutting was not the best term to use for overarching issues. Some interventions suggested indigenous peoples and local communities should be considered both as a general principle or an overarching element that applies to the whole post-2020 global biodiversity framework, as

well as considered in each of the relevant targets with clear indicators. Alternatively, engagement of indigenous peoples and local communities could be considered a specific global target.

Areas proposed for amendments/refinements or requiring further development/consideration

Some interventions drew attention to capacity-building needs and access to education and training, respecting the cultural diversity of indigenous peoples and local communities. More than half of rural communities source their livelihoods to biodiversity. Indigenous peoples and local communities bare the highest burden for conservation and incentives are needed to encourage conservation. The post-2020 global biodiversity framework must prioritize equitable distribution of biodiversity (conservation) costs and benefits across all levels from local to global. Compensation and restoration mechanisms are needed. Resource mobilization should take into account the plight of indigenous peoples and local communities and make sound practical impacts of their livelihoods, recognizing them as custodians of biodiversity. Indigenous peoples and local communities must be emphasized as integral elements of the global biodiversity framework with smart targets and indicators. Indigenous peoples and local communities should benefit from the biodiversity under their stewardship, and there should be incentives for conservation and sustainable use. The global biodiversity framework and relevant documentation should be made available in plain language to ensure comprehension by a wide range of actors including indigenous peoples and local communities. Some interventions noted synergies between biodiversity conventions and culture conventions and called for strengthen cooperation between “nature and culture” and intangible cultural heritage, for the successful preservation of biological and cultural diversity. Some interventions noted the centrality of indigenous peoples and local communities to the goals of the Convention and achieving the vision of living in harmony with nature. Some also noted the importance of cultural traditions, including sciences and traditional knowledge, in achieving the 2050 Vision. Nature-based solutions should draw on the application of cultural intelligence and innovation, feature indigenous and local knowledge and, hence, could be termed nature- and culture-based solutions. Some also noted the importance of mainstreaming traditional knowledge across policy, science, technology, education curricula, and the importance of the transmission of knowledge, for transformational change as well as for inspiring creative and meaningful actions. Some interventions also emphasized the importance of human rights and a human rights-based approach as enablers, as well as synergies between international instruments, including the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples.

E. Gender

Areas of convergence

There is general support for gender equality, especially promoting the role of women from indigenous peoples and local communities and rural women, who hold particular knowledge of the traditional and sustainable use of biological resources. Women and girls should be recognized as key actors and agents of change whose engagement is critical for conservation and sustainable use, and not simply as recipients of biological resources and ecosystem services. The integration of gender equality issues into efforts to halt biodiversity loss is essential and is a critical cross-cutting issue.

Areas of divergence

Various approaches are proposed including as a cross-cutting issue or through a succinct goal and related targets with specific indicators. Some interventions suggest that gender could be considered a general principle that applies to the post-2020 global biodiversity framework, as well as being considered in each of the relevant targets with clear indicators.

Areas proposed for amendments/refinements or requiring further development/consideration

Some interventions noted that the implementation of the Gender Plan of Action has been a major challenge but looked forward to the integration of gender as a priority in the post-2020 global biodiversity framework, empowering women and girls as key actors in conservation and sustainable use.

F. Youth

Areas of convergence

Many interventions called for greater engagement and participation of youth, noting that youth have an important role in the post-2020 global biodiversity framework spanning 2020 to 2050. Some also called for the empowerment and mobilization of youth, as agents of change, in the framework.

Areas of divergence

-

Points for consideration

Several interventions raised the issue of inter- and intra-generational equity in resource use and management. These terms refer to equity both horizontally within present generations and vertically between present and future generations.
