

## Convention on Biological Diversity

Distr.  
GENERAL

CBD/WG2020/3/6  
24 November 2021

ORIGINAL: ENGLISH

---

OPEN-ENDED WORKING GROUP  
ON THE POST-2020 GLOBAL  
BIODIVERSITY FRAMEWORK  
Third meeting (resumed)  
Venue and dates to be determined  
Agenda item 4

### **REFLECTIONS BY THE CO-CHAIRS FOLLOWING THE FIRST SESSION OF THE THIRD MEETING OF THE WORKING GROUP ON THE POST-2020 GLOBAL BIODIVERSITY FRAMEWORK**

#### **I. BACKGROUND, PURPOSE AND SCOPE OF THIS REPORT**

1. This reflections document has been prepared by the Co-Chairs of the Open-ended Working Group on the Post-2020 Global Biodiversity Framework to support Parties and observers in their deliberations at the resumed meeting of the Working Group. It is not replacing the first draft of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework ([CBD/WG2020/3/3](#)), which, together with the report on the first part of the meeting, remains the basis for negotiation at the resumed meeting. It draws upon the proposals delivered orally by Parties and stakeholders during the first part of the third meeting of the Working Group, and those submitted in writing in response to requests for submissions, as contained in the contact group co-leads' reports annexed to the meeting report ([CBD/WG2020/3/5](#)). Only comments by stakeholders that have received Party support and that were included in the co-leads' reports have been considered in the preparation of this reflections note.
2. None of the suggestions contained in this reflections note are to be understood as prescribing text or outcomes, rather they are merely intended to facilitate deliberations of the Working Group by building on areas of convergence, offering initial ideas how areas of divergence may be resolved, and by providing further information and explaining the rationale underpinning relevant elements of the first draft of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework ([CBD/WG2020/3/3](#)).
3. It is hoped that the reflections provided in this document will assist Parties and stakeholders to advance their deliberations at the resumed physical meeting of the third meeting of the Working Group in January 2022 in order to negotiate an effective, ambitious and practical framework to be adopted at the resumed session of the fifteenth meeting of the Conference of the Parties to the Convention on Biological Diversity, in Kunming, China, in May 2022.
4. This document is structured as follows: Part II contains the Co-Chairs' reflections on the overall structure of and rationale behind the first draft of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework (CBD/WG2020/3/3). Parts III to VII contain reflections on the various elements of the framework, mirroring the sequence of the first draft – beginning with sections A to E, the 2050 Goals, 2030 Action Targets and closing with sections H to K of the framework. Part VIII contains reflections on the draft

monitoring framework. Part IX contains reflections on the draft decision accompanying the adoption of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework.

5. Under each part of this document, and for each element of the first draft discussed at the first part of the third meeting of the Working Group, the Co-Chairs have:

(a) Summarize what they have heard during the meeting – though readers should not expect to see every single point of view expressed reflected in this summary. These summaries are intended to complement, rather than replace or supersede the report on the meeting and the official submissions of Parties;

(b) Provide their reflections detailing context or link to other elements of the framework and evolution over time of the successive versions of the text of the framework;

(c) Where appropriate, suggest questions that Parties and stakeholders may wish to consider when discussing particular elements of the framework at the resumed physical session of the working group;

(d) When deemed useful and feasible, provide concrete suggestions, recommendations, or proposals for new or compromise text for some specific elements of the framework.

## **II. REFLECTIONS ON THE OVERALL STRUCTURE OF, AND RATIONALE BEHIND, THE POST-2020 GLOBAL BIODIVERSITY FRAMEWORK**

### *What we heard*

(a) A number of Parties questioned the value of the milestones, as they found they overcomplicated the architecture of the framework. Others considered that the milestones were important to ensure that outcomes were considered and assessed in 2030 rather than in only 2050;

(b) A number of Parties proposed that the targets be nested under specific goals, while others noted the multiple linkages between some goals and targets;

(c) A number of Parties expressed a desire to remove the numerical aspects from the goals, while others suggested retaining them;

(d) Finally, a number of Parties raised issues with the implementation timeframe, given concerns that due to the ongoing COVID-19 pandemic and resulting delays in development of the framework, it might not be possible to fully implement the framework over the remaining 8 years to 2030.

### *Suggestions*

6. From the inception of the work of the Working Group on the Post-2020 Global Biodiversity Framework (first meeting of the Working Group in Nairobi), Parties have asked for a clear and logical structure for the global biodiversity framework. The architecture starts with the Goals, which are meant to be outcome oriented and describe the state of outcomes desired for 2050 time, thus translating the 2050 Vision of “living in harmony with nature” into tangible elements.

7. The Milestones provide a bridge between the 2030 and 2050, by indicating to Parties and stakeholders where on the path to “living in harmony with nature” they would need to be in 2030 if they want to reach the Goals of the framework in 2050. As such, the Milestones contribute to the framework by allowing Parties and stakeholders to assess their progress towards the 2050 goals in 2030, enabling course correction, if needed.

8. The Targets are meant to be action oriented and hence provide direction for the actions required over the short term, i.e. in the decade up to 2030. Note that achieving any particular goal requires action across multiple targets. At the same time, the actions associated with each target typically contribute to more than one goal.

9. The monitoring framework for the post-2020 global biodiversity framework provides specificity as to what factors should be considered in implementing each goal or target, and allows Parties to assess the global progress and to adjust efforts as needed.

10. In the future, if Parties decide to develop additional biodiversity frameworks, for example for the periods from 2030-2040 and/or 2040-2050, they may wish to use the same approach. As such, the progress over the three decades could be easily identified and, if needed, the appropriate measures taken to ensure that the sum of the efforts will lead to achieving the 2050 Vision.

11. In the light of the points above, the following considerations should be born in mind when considering the structure of the framework:

(a) With regard to milestones, Parties should carefully consider whether the Milestones should be removed from the framework; Milestones tell us how far the status of things should have changed by 2030 in order to reach the 2050 Goals. Targets are focusing on actions (need to reach Milestone and in turn Goals). Losing the milestones would mean losing the capacity to evaluate the effectiveness of the targets in achieving the goals and lessen the urgency of ensuring progress against the goals;

(b) With regard to the suggestions to nest the targets under the goals: A one-to-one relationship is not easy to make. Some targets contribute to more than one goal and some goals are enabled by more than one target. For example, targets 1 to 13 contribute to both goals A and B, while targets 14 to 21 contribute to all goals. Given this, Parties may wish to consider what such a nested approach would look like in practice. An alternative would be to prepare a graphical representation of the relationship between goals and targets;

(c) Regarding the implementation timeframe for the framework, while it was initially intended that implementation would take place over the 2020 decade, that timeframe has shrunk due to the delayed adoption of the Framework. As prompted under footnote 7 on page 4 of the first draft, Parties “may wish to consider reviewing the 2030 date”. This should be done keeping in mind the following decadal plan to 2050. There are many ways to address this, including assuming that progress has been made since 2020 and leaving the 2030 deadline as is and continuing with two additional decadal plans, or otherwise rebalancing the time period number or length. Parties and stakeholders may also wish to bear in mind the urgency for action this decade according to many recent assessments. Finally, 2030 aligns with the date for the Sustainable Development Goals as well as for many actions under the Paris Agreement on climate change.

12. Goals are meant to provide a way to objectively assess whether the Vision has been reached (or not). Their numerical elements are central to this and enable the definition of Milestones. Should they be removed parties would lose the ability to evaluate whether their actions are effective. Should the numerical aspects be eliminated, parties should re-evaluate the usefulness of Goals and Milestones at all.

13. The next few paragraphs will provide a practical illustration of the rationale behind the above-described architecture.

### III. REFLECTIONS ON SECTIONS A TO E

#### Section A – Background

**First draft** - 1. Biodiversity, and the benefits it provides, is fundamental to human well-being and a healthy planet. Despite ongoing efforts, biodiversity is deteriorating worldwide and this decline is projected to continue or worsen under business-as-usual scenarios. The post-2020 global biodiversity framework<sup>1</sup> builds on the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020 and sets out an ambitious plan to implement broad-based action to bring about a transformation in society's relationship with biodiversity and to ensure that, by 2050, the shared vision of living in harmony with nature is fulfilled.

#### *What we heard*

14. In general, the comments we heard from Parties seem to broadly agree with the original text provided in the first draft. Delegates have added several qualifiers that increase the level of detail by including statistics and examples as well as references to specific reports. The new element we identified among the comments concerns proposals to add a reference to 'ecosystem services' to strengthen the links between the biosphere and humans.

#### *Suggestions*

15. The detailed additions provided would nearly triple the length of the original paragraph. Having heard Parties and stakeholders' repeated calls to keep the post-2020 framework concise and communicable we would recommend keeping this section brief, striking a careful balance between simplicity and completeness. While the recent reports such as the IPBES Global Assessment provide important reference points, including an explicit reference here should be weighed against the fact that the timeline of the framework goes up to 2050 and new and updated reports would be released in the meantime.

#### *Question for consideration by Parties and stakeholders*

How much detail should this section contain?

#### Section B – Purpose

**First draft** - 2. The framework aims to galvanize urgent and transformative action by Governments and all of society, including indigenous peoples and local communities, civil society, and businesses, to achieve the outcomes it sets out in its vision, mission, goals and targets, and thereby to contribute to the objectives of the Convention on Biological Diversity, its Protocols, and other biodiversity related multilateral agreements, processes and instruments.

#### *What we heard*

16. We heard general support for this paragraph and additional suggestions to include further detail. Delegates have suggested adding references to specific stakeholder groups and to specific international agreements and processes. We also note a proposal to change the reference to 'all of society' to 'relevant stakeholders', possibly narrowing down the scope.

#### *Suggestions*

17. Regarding the groups and organizations that should be explicitly referred to in this section, we would like to point out that the new section on guidance for the implementation of the framework proposed below (see section IV below) would apply to entire the post-2020 framework, and makes explicit that this is a framework for all, highlighting the importance of ensuring inclusivity and broad participation in its

---

<sup>1</sup> The term "post-2020 global biodiversity framework" is used as a placeholder, pending a decision on the final name of the framework by the Conference of the Parties at its fifteenth meeting. Similarly, the word "framework" is used throughout the text as a placeholder.

implementation. In the light of this, we would suggest that it may not be necessary to refer to specific groups in this section.

**First draft - 3.** The framework aims to facilitate implementation, which will be primarily through activities at the national level, with supporting action at the subnational, regional and global levels. Specifically, it provides a global, outcome-oriented framework for the development of national, and as appropriate, regional, goals and targets and, as necessary, the updating of national biodiversity strategies and action plans to achieve these, and to facilitate regular monitoring and review of progress at the global level. It also aims to promote synergies and coordination between the Convention on Biological Diversity and its Protocols, and other relevant processes.

*What we heard*

18. We heard general agreement with this paragraph and adding further detail to proposed text of the first draft. These additions include references to various principles under the Convention as well as references to other multilateral agreements and processes and enhancing synergies among them. We note in this context the suggestion to include a reference to the principle of common but differentiated responsibilities.

*Suggestions*

19. As most of the principles referred to are either already included in the text of the Convention or in other international agreements or declarations there may be no need to reaffirm these principles in this paragraph. We have included a provision to reflect this in a new section on guidance for the implementation of the framework proposed below (section IV). Further discussion on the principle of common but differentiated responsibilities may be best done in the context of resource mobilization.

### **Section C - Relationship with 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development**

**First draft - 4.** The framework is a fundamental contribution to the implementation of the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development.<sup>2</sup> At the same time, progress towards the Sustainable Development Goals will help to create the conditions necessary to implement the framework.

*What we heard*

20. We heard proposals to include references to a variety of processes and agreements as well as global challenges connected to the loss of biodiversity and references to different value systems.

*Suggestions*

21. The original aim of this section as contained in the first draft was to focus on the relationship between the post-2020 global biodiversity framework and the Sustainable Development Goals contained in the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development. References to other processes here may diminish the importance and visibility of the 2030 Agenda vis-à-vis other processes. Including additional references beyond the 2030 Agenda in this paragraph would open a floodgate and thus dilute the focus and purpose of this section. Parties and stakeholders may also wish to keep in mind that this is a 30-year process (2050 Vision) and not all processes need to be mentioned.

22. We also clearly heard the desire of some Parties and stakeholders to highlight synergies and linkages between the post-2020 framework, the 2030 Agenda and other multilateral processes and agreements, and to recognize different value systems and conceptualizations of nature including 'Mother Earth'. As these are recurrent themes among the proposals, we heard to the various sections of the

---

<sup>2</sup> General Assembly resolution 70/1.

framework, we consider them cross-cutting and have therefore included explicit references to reflect these aspects in a new section on guidance for the implementation of the framework proposed below.

#### **Section D – Theory of change (paragraphs 5 to 8 and figure 1)**

**First draft - 5.** The framework is built around a theory of change (see figure 1) which recognizes that urgent policy action globally, regionally and nationally is required to transform economic, social and financial models so that the trends that have exacerbated biodiversity loss will stabilize in the next 10 years (by 2030) and allow for the recovery of natural ecosystems in the following 20 years, with net improvements by 2050 to achieve the Convention’s vision of “living in harmony with nature by 2050”. It also assumes that a whole-of-government and society approach is necessary to make the changes needed over the next 10 years as a stepping stone towards the achievement of the 2050 Vision. As such, Governments and societies need to determine priorities and allocate financial and other resources, internalize the value of nature and recognize the cost of inaction.


6. The framework’s theory of change assumes that transformative actions are taken to (a) put in place tools and solutions for implementation and mainstreaming, (b) reduce the threats to biodiversity and (c) ensure that biodiversity is used sustainably in order to meet people’s needs and that these actions are supported by enabling conditions, and adequate means of implementation, including financial resources, capacity and technology. It also assumes that progress is monitored in a transparent and accountable manner with adequate stocktaking exercises to ensure that, by 2030, the world is on a path to reach the 2050 Vision for biodiversity.<sup>3</sup>

7. The theory of change for the framework acknowledges the need for appropriate recognition of gender equality, women’s empowerment, youth, gender-responsive approaches and the full and effective participation of indigenous peoples and local communities in the implementation of this framework. Further, it is built upon the recognition that its implementation will be done in partnership among organizations at the global, national and local levels to leverage ways to build a momentum for success. It will be implemented taking a rights-based approach and recognizing the principle of intergenerational equity.

8. The framework is complementary to and supportive of the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development. It also takes into account the long-term strategies and targets of multilateral environment agreements, including biodiversity-related and Rio conventions, to ensure synergistic delivery of benefits from all the agreements for the planet and people.

---

<sup>3</sup> The Working Group on the Post-2020 Global Biodiversity Framework may wish to consider reviewing the 2030 date in the light of the delay in the approval of the framework.



### *What we heard*

23. We heard broad agreement with the proposed text of the first draft but also heard suggestions to further build on it. In this respect, we heard two types of comments: proposals that increase precision and proposals that add new concepts. In particular, we note the suggestion to include a reference to the drivers of biodiversity loss.

### *Suggestions*

24. For all paragraphs of this section, Parties and stakeholders may wish to reflect on the level of detail and precision this section should contain.

25. We would like to stress that the original text in paragraph 6 of the first draft reflects the Convention's objectives and would therefore express some reservations on re-wording pre-negotiated concepts such as sustainable use.

26. Paragraph 7 contains some of the principles and cross-cutting issues that some Parties and stakeholders have suggested to include in the framework during their interventions at part one of the third meeting of the Working Group in August 2021. As this paragraph applies not only to the theory of change but reflects some of the key principles, we have taken it as a basis for drafting a proposed new section on guidance for the implementation of the framework, see point 9 below. If Parties support the inclusion of such a dedicated overarching section on guidance, then this paragraph would need to be deleted to avoid duplication.


27. Since section D of the framework focuses on the theory of change, in paragraph 8, it may be preferable to replace 'framework' with 'theory of change'. The complementarity of the framework with the 2030 Agenda is already highlighted in paragraph 4.

28. Based on the feedback on Figure 1, we recommend replacing 'today' with 2022 and inserting 2030 in the timeline at the bottom. Further, we would suggest updating the left column of the figure outlining the

current status that the new framework seeks to transform to include more concrete examples of the challenges driving biodiversity loss today. A revised version is included below.

29. Finally, going back to the structure of the framework and linking it to the theory of change, keeping the milestones would be useful to assess the progress made in 2030.

**Revised figure 1. Theory of change of the framework**



**Section E - 2050 Vision and 2030 mission**

**First draft - 9.** The vision of the framework is a world of living in harmony with nature where: “By 2050, biodiversity is valued, conserved, restored and wisely used, maintaining ecosystem services, sustaining a healthy planet and delivering benefits essential for all people.”

*What we heard*

30. There have been suggestions to add more detail to the 2050 Vision.

*Suggestions*

31. We would like to remind Parties and stakeholders that decision 14/34 specifically excluded the Vision from the scope of the global biodiversity framework negotiation. This text is pre-agreed language adopted in decision X/2. Subsequently in decision 14/34, it was decided 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”. As such, the text in this paragraph of the framework has already been agreed by the Conference of the Parties and changes to it should be avoided.



**First draft** - 10. The mission of the framework for the period up to 2030, towards the 2050 vision is: “To take urgent action across society to conserve and sustainably use biodiversity and ensure the fair and equitable sharing of benefits from the use of genetics resources, to put biodiversity on a path to recovery by 2030 for the benefit of planet and people”<sup>4</sup>

*What we heard*

32. We heard a number of proposals to add references to the first objective of the Convention, references to different value systems and conceptualizations of nature, as well as references to resource mobilization. Several Parties suggested changes to make the level of ambition in the Mission clearer, including by adding “ensuring a net gain by 2030” or “nature-positive”. However, other countries raised concerns regarding understanding the feasibility of these concepts.

*Suggestions*

33. The original text of the proposed mission as contained in the first draft was discussed at the first meeting of the Working Group, in Nairobi, where Parties wanted to maintain a balance between the three objectives of the Convention. We also recall that many Parties and stakeholders have expressed a desire for the post-2020 global biodiversity framework to remain as concise and communicable as possible. We therefore recommend that the 2030 Mission as a central guiding element of the framework be worded as clearly and concisely as possible. For the same reason, it may not be necessary to include explicit references to resource mobilization and different value systems or conceptualizations of nature in the mission; the latter has been included under a new overarching section on guidance for the implementation of the framework proposed below.

#### **IV. PROPOSAL FOR A NEW SECTION ON GUIDANCE FOR THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE FRAMEWORK**

*What we heard*

34. As noted above many Parties and stakeholders have suggested the need to reflect certain concepts across the post-2020 global biodiversity framework. These include gender responsiveness, rights-based approaches, synergies, different conceptualizations of Nature and biodiversity values, and ensuring participation and inclusivity. Numerous text proposals were made for each concept. At the same time, many Parties and stakeholders have expressed the need to keep the framework simple and easy to communicate.

*Suggestions*

35. To avoid overburdening the text and to ensure that the post-2020 framework remains clear, concise and communicable, we propose creating a dedicated section on guidance for the implementation of the Framework. We have provided a text proposal below based on paragraph 7 of Section D of the first draft which already contains some of the guidance and cross-cutting issues to which Parties and stakeholders have proposed additions during their interventions at the third meeting of the Working Group in August 2021 as well as proposals for guidance for implementation we heard during the formal meetings of the Subsidiary Body on Implementation and the Subsidiary Body on Scientific, Technical and Technological

---

<sup>4</sup> In the 2030 Mission, “to take urgent action” reflects the need for action to be taken this decade to address the biodiversity crisis. “Across society” reflects the need for actions to be taken by all stakeholders, and for mainstreaming across sectors of society and the economy. “To put nature on a path to recovery” implies the need for positive action-oriented approach and the need for concerted and strategic action across a range of issues. It also implies the need for a stabilization in the rate of loss of biodiversity and enhanced protection and restoration. “For the benefit of people and planet” highlights elements of nature’s contributions to people, makes a strong link to the delivery of the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development and its Sustainable Development Goals while also recognizing the intrinsic and existential importance of biodiversity. The 2030 deadline articulates that this mission is a milestone on the way to the 2050 Vision of “living in harmony with nature” and reinforces the need for urgent action this decade.

Advice in May 2021. To ensure high visibility we would recommend placing this new section between sections B (Purpose) and C (Relationship with the 2030 Agenda).

*Alternative text*

### **B.bis Guidance for the implementation of the framework**

36. The following guidance was used in the development of the global biodiversity framework and should guide its implementation:

1. This is a framework for all, for the whole of government and the whole of society. Its successful implementation relies on actions by national Governments, including subnational governments, cities and other local authorities, intergovernmental organizations, non-governmental organizations, indigenous peoples and local communities, women's groups, youth groups, the business and finance community, the scientific community, academia, faith-based organizations, representatives of sectors related to or dependent on biodiversity, citizens at large, and other stakeholders.
2. The framework's implementation and effectiveness will be further enhanced by collaboration and coordination with a view to enhancing coherence and synergies between the Convention on Biological Diversity, the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety, the Nagoya Protocol on access and benefit sharing, other biodiversity-related conventions and Rio conventions, and other relevant multilateral agreements and international processes, as applicable, at the global, regional, subregional and national levels.
3. The framework acknowledges the need for appropriate recognition of rights-based approaches, gender equality, gender-responsive approaches, empowerment of women and girls and youth and Indigenous Peoples and local communities, and their full, effective and equal participation in its implementation and review.
4. The framework will be implemented respecting human rights, the right to a safe, clean, healthy and sustainable environment, indigenous peoples and local communities' tenure rights as well as the right to free, prior and informed consent as reflected in the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples, as well as intergenerational equity, and mindful of the diverse world views, values and knowledge systems, including different conceptualizations of Nature and biodiversity, including those recognized by some cultures as Mother Earth.
5. The goals and targets of the framework are integrated and are intended to balance the three objectives of the Convention on Biological Diversity. While some targets may be more relevant to specific local contexts and circumstances, efforts by all governments and stakeholders across all goals and targets will be essential to ensure the successful implementation of the framework as a whole.
6. The global biodiversity framework is to be implemented in line with the objectives and other provisions of the Convention on Biological Diversity, and of the Cartagena and Nagoya Protocols, as applicable.
7. The framework can only be implemented if adequate resources, from all sources, are made available and easily accessible, reducing the burden on accessing resources.

## V. GOALS, MILESTONES AND TARGETS

### 2050 Goals

#### Goal A

**First draft** - The integrity of all ecosystems is enhanced, with an increase of at least 15 per cent in the area, connectivity and integrity of natural ecosystems, supporting healthy and resilient populations of all species, the rate of extinctions has been reduced at least tenfold, and the risk of species extinctions across all taxonomic and functional groups, is halved, and genetic diversity of wild and domesticated species is safeguarded, with at least 90 per cent of genetic diversity within all species maintained.

#### *What we heard*

(a) The majority of Parties noted that the three components of biodiversity (ecosystems, species and genetic diversity) should be covered under this goal. Some Parties questioned the scientific basis of the numerical aspects of the goal and whether the current proposal can be realistically achieved, while others called for still higher ambition;

(b) Relatedly, some Parties questioned the feasibility and appropriateness of having numerical values in this goal and some questioned if all of the goals should have numeric values or if these should only be included in targets;

(c) Some Parties also noted that some terms in this goal, including “integrity” and “healthy” need further clarity and a common understanding”. The glossary for the post-2020 global biodiversity framework<sup>5</sup> could help to address this issue.

#### *Rationale behind the numeric aspects*

(a) Scientific basis:

- (i) 15% increase in area, connectivity and integrity of natural ecosystems - Models, scenarios and other studies suggest that an increase in the area of natural ecosystems of the order of 10 to 15 per cent, globally, across all terrestrial ecosystem types, by 2050 may be feasible. As such, we are envisioning an average 5% increase (Milestone A1) every decade between 2020 and 2050, for a total of 15%. This increase would reflect the combined outcomes of actions proposed under the targets, in particular targets 1-3 (spatial planning, restorations and conservation) noting that most other targets would directly or indirectly reduce other drivers of biodiversity loss;
- (ii) Tenfold reduction in rate of extinctions and a 50% decrease in the risk of species extinctions - About 1 million species (or 13 per cent) are currently threatened with extinction, although the extinction risk varies significantly across taxa. It will be necessary to reduce both the extinction rate and the extinction risk, as well as to maintain or improve the population abundances and the geographical extent of all species. A tenfold reduction in the rate of extinction is proposed as an ambitious objective, given that a zero rate is unrealistic and would not account for extinctions due to natural reasons as well as ongoing climate change (note that the most ambitious climate goal aims for a 1.5 degree limit, not zero degrees). It should also be kept in mind that a recovery strategy would take generally more than ten years to show results. To build towards this goal, Milestone A2 proposes that the increase in the extinction rate be halted or reversed (i.e. proposing a reversal in the current trend). Further, Milestone A2 proposes that extinction risk should be reduced by at least 10 per cent, with a decrease in the proportion of species that are threatened. This would be a first step towards an overall reduction of 50% by 2050;


---

<sup>5</sup> CBD/WG2020/3/3/Add.2/Rev.1.

(iii) Further Milestone A2 also proposes that the abundance and distribution of populations of species be enhanced or at least maintained. This issue relates to overall quality and quantity of populations, which is often used as a proxy to assessing the viability of a given species;

(iv) 90% of genetic diversity is maintained - Determining precise quantitative targets for maintaining genetic diversity may be difficult, but current knowledge suggests that maintaining a minimum of 90 per cent of the genetic diversity within species (i.e. across populations of the same species) by 2050 would be consistent with the 2050 Vision. This value is in line with suggested approaches for the protection of genetic diversity in agricultural crops and animals in zoos where the conservation of 95% and 90% of genetic diversity, respectively, have been suggested. Milestone 3 builds towards this goal, with a focus on increasing the proportion of species for which genetic diversity is maintained, while the goal sets an ambitious objective to maintain this level of genetic diversity for all species by 2050.

(b) Additionality in relation to the targets: 15% increase in area, connectivity and integrity of natural ecosystems – The graphic below attempts to demonstrate visually the link between Goal A, Milestone A1 and targets 1, 2 and 3. As such, it is possible to see how an improvement in connectivity and integrity, which would increase the total amount of functional ecosystems, will also contribute to restoration efforts, retaining wild areas and the protection and conservation lands and oceans.



*Questions for consideration by Parties and stakeholders*

- (a) Is the concept and/or wording of Goal A too complex and if so how could it be simplified?
- (b) Should Goal A be (re)split into 3 parts addressing each component of biodiversity?
- (c) Should this and the other goals contain numeric elements or should they be purely aspirational?

*Suggestions*

37. We heard from some parties that we should consider splitting this goal into three parts - each one addressing one component of biodiversity. We note that, in the zero draft presented to the Working Group at its second meeting, this goal was presented as three separate goals. However, during the second meeting of the Working Group, we heard that we should combine the three components into one goal. This was the

approach we took in the first draft of the framework presented to the Working Group at its third meeting. Parties may wish to further reflect on this issue.

## Goal B

**First draft** - Nature's contributions to people are valued, maintained or enhanced through conservation and sustainable use supporting the global development agenda for the benefit of all.

### *What we heard*

38. This is a goal for which we heard broad support. However, some Parties noted that its measurability, and that of its associated targets, should be improved, the including through updates to the monitoring framework. Further some Parties suggested that the term “valued” may be inappropriate in the context of this goal. Similarly, some suggested that the term “ecosystem services” be used rather than “nature’s contributions to people”.

### *Numeric aspects*

39. Goal B does not contain a numeric element, as it is challenging to define a single metric for the full range of nature’s contributions to people or ecosystem services addressed by the goal. Notwithstanding this, the current formulation does set out the desired outcome that should be achieved by 2050. The proposed goal is also linked to the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development which provides a basis on which to build.

### *Suggestions*

40. Regarding the various comments on the use of the word value, we wish to note that the term “valued” is also used in our 2050 Vision (i.e. “By 2050, biodiversity is valued, conserved, restored and wisely used, maintaining ecosystem services, sustaining a healthy planet and delivering benefits essential for all people.”). As such our suggestion is that it would be appropriate to use the term “valued” in the goal. In given the range of issues addressed by the goal and that the goal points to a desired outcome a specific numeric value in goal may not be feasible or needed. Numeric aspects could also be picked up in the targets associated with this goal and in the monitoring framework.

### *Possible alternative text*

Given the views expressed on “nature’s contributions to people” we would suggested instead to use “ecosystem services”. As such, Parties may wish to consider reformulating Goal B, as follows, in the next iteration of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework.

**Alternative text** - “Ecosystem services are valued, maintained or enhanced through conservation and sustainable use supporting the global development agenda for the benefit of all.”

## Goal C

**First draft** - The benefits from the utilization of genetic resources are shared fairly and equitably, with a substantial increase in both monetary and non-monetary benefits shared, including for the conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity.

### *What we heard*

41. Overall, we heard two types of comments on this goal. First, we heard some cross-cutting comments regarding the implications of this goal for indigenous peoples and local communities. We will address this concern elsewhere in this report (see section IV). Further, we heard comments regarding the scope of this target (i.e. whether it should focus on the Nagoya Protocol and/or of the Convention on Biological Diversity). Also, some Parties suggested that this goal should refer to digital sequence information.

*Numeric aspects*

42. Goal C does not contain a numeric value, but rather contains the qualitative term “significantly”. The current formulation indicates the desired outcome by suggesting a direction for the required change. “Significantly” should be interpreted as an improvement in the range of at least 50-75% more benefits, monetary and non-monetary, being shared fairly and equitably.

*Question for consideration by the Parties and stakeholders*

43. How do parties define substantial change in terms of monetary and non-monetary benefits shared? What other term might be preferred here? Should a numerical value be used instead and if so what should that value be?

*Suggestions*

44. With regard to digital sequence information, we would like to recall that a separate DSI process is ongoing. Given that the discussions related to DSI are ongoing, our suggestion is to not include DSI in this target at this stage and instead await the resolution of the formal DSI process. Once that formal process is concluded, Parties may wish to revisit this issue. There is also an option to include a reference to DSI in target 13, so that the Goal can be retained as a more general, higher level, outcome statement

**Goal D**

**First draft:** The gap between available financial and other means of implementation, and those necessary to achieve the 2050 Vision, is closed.

*What we heard*


- (a) Many Parties have emphasized the importance of ensuring appropriate financial and other resources are available to support implementation;
- (b) Some have also suggested that the goal should have a focus on financial flows from developed countries to developing countries;
- (c) We also heard that other means of implementation may need to be explicitly addressed in this goal;
- (d) We have heard from some that in order to ensure that adequate means of implementation are available, we will not be able to rely on Official Development Aid alone.

*Numeric aspects*

While this target does not have an explicit numerical aspect, it does speak to closing the financing gap i.e. all financial needs are met in 2050. This will be done by both decreasing harmful expenditures, essentially through elimination of negative incentives and subsidies (proposed target 18), as well as by aligning financial flows (target 14) and by making new funds available (proposed target 19).

45. There is debate on the extent of this financing gap however available evidence suggests that it is reasonable to expect to reduce it by 700 billion USD per year by 2030 (Milestone D1) which would be accomplished by a reduction of cost of \$500 billion per year (target 18) and an increase in fund available to \$200 billion per year (target 19) by 2030.

46. The following graph illustrate the link between Goal D, Milestone D.1, and targets 18 and 19.



*Questions for consideration by the Parties and stakeholders*

- (a) What does “means of implementation” mean to parties?
- (b) Is it clear enough that Goal D addresses the need for other means of implementation such as capacity-building and technology transfer?

*Observation*

47. Given the significance of the financial gap and fiscal reality, there is a need to marshal all sources of funding, including from the private sector, which can be achieved through better disclosure, accounting. These combined efforts will be instrumental to closing the financing gap. Yet governments will continue to have a crucial role to direct the actions that will lead to the achievement of this goal.

*Alternative text*

To further clarify the intent of this goal, the Co-Chairs are suggesting two possible additions as follows:

**Building on past investments**, the gap between available financial and other means of implementation, and those necessary to achieve the 2050 Vision, is closed **and resources have been increased**.

## 2030 Milestones

*What we heard*

48. There was unfortunately no formal opportunity to discuss the milestones during the virtual first part of the third meeting of the Working Group in August 2021. However, many parties made comments regarding the milestones, including some who wanted the removal of milestones from the framework, others had questions about how the milestones fit with goals and targets and the value they add.

*Suggestions*

49. We would like to note that milestones were not included in the zero draft of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework that was presented to the Working Group at its second meeting. They were included in the first draft of the framework in response to comments and requests made during the second meeting of the Working Group. The milestones are intended to provide a benchmark to evaluate the effectiveness and outcomes of the action taken to reach the 2050 Vision in 2030 and to enable any course correction that

may be needed. Milestones may also be helpful in the preparation of global assessments. However, milestones do add a level of complexity to the framework and thus could make it more challenging to communicate and understand for non-experts. Parties ought to consider these points before making a final decision as to whether milestones should be omitted from the next iteration of the framework.

*Questions for consideration by the Parties and stakeholders*

What is the role of milestones in the framework? Should we remove the goals and milestones from the framework? (Refer to section II of this document, above)

## **2030 Targets**

### **Target 1**

**First draft** - Ensure that all land and sea areas globally are under integrated biodiversity-inclusive spatial planning addressing land- and sea-use change, retaining existing intact and wilderness areas.

### **Component 1: Land use planning**

*What we heard*

50. Overall, there was general support with the intent of this target. However, there were differing views regarding its numerical aspect. Some suggested the urgency of having 100% of global area under spatial planning by 2030, while others commented that such a level may not be realistic. Specifically, with regard to the retention of existing intact and wilderness areas, there were differing perspectives. For example, some suggested that the focus should be on retaining all wild spaces and while others noted the need allow a certain amount of conversion to address human needs.

*Numeric aspects*

51. The proposed wording of the target calls for all land and sea areas to be under spatial planning. However it does not specify the characteristics (e.g. quality, granularity, etc.) of the spatial planning, but rather emphasises the need for comprehensive and systematic approaches to land and sea-use planning and to retain existing intact wilderness areas.

52. Such an approach would allow for national flexibility in how spatial planning is implemented and used, including, for example, determining the best way to protect and preserve the rights of indigenous peoples and local communities and planning for economic, industrial and extractive activities that would meet the growing needs of human populations.

*Questions for consideration by Parties and stakeholders*

- (a) What needs to be done to achieve 100% of spatial planning by all Parties?
- (b) What levels (extent and specificity) of national spatial planning are necessary and feasible?
- (c) How fast/ by what time can parties get to the necessary level of land use planning?
- (d) Would changing “all” reduce the tools available for better planning for economic, industrial and extractive activities that would meet the growing needs of human populations and preserve the rights of indigenous peoples and local communities?
- (e) What should we consider to ensure the preservation and protection of the rights of indigenous peoples and local communities in relation to spatial planning? How can we ensure those rights are protected?
- (f) Is the retention of all existing intact and wilderness areas realistic in a context of demographic growth?

*Suggestions*

53. Regarding the use of “retaining existing intact and wilderness areas”, some Parties stated that this could impede necessary socioeconomic development to respond to the needs of their growing populations.



However, intact and wilderness areas are valuable, as critical strongholds for endangered species, for carbon storage and sequestration, for buffering and regulating local climates, and for supporting many indigenous peoples and local communities. As such, their retention will play a critical role towards achieving the 2050 Vision. Further, “retaining existing intact and wilderness areas” can be achieved by most Parties, through careful land and sea-use planning, improved efficiency in agricultural and other practices, as well as the restoration of degraded ecosystems. Given this Parties may wish to consider maintaining the emphasis on maximizing the amount of land and sea areas under spatial planning and retaining as many as possible of existing intact and wilderness areas.

## Target 2

**First draft** - Ensure that at least 20 per cent of degraded freshwater, marine and terrestrial ecosystems are under restoration, ensuring connectivity among them and focusing on priority ecosystems.

### *What we heard*

- (a) Parties expressed general support for a target dedicated to the restoration of degraded ecosystems;
- (b) However, there were different views as to what amount of restoration (percentage or absolute number) would be realistically achievable by 2030;
- (c) Further some also noted that it would be useful to identify a baseline for the actions towards this target;
- (d) It was also noted by some that the wording “freshwater, marine and terrestrial ecosystems” is overly complicated. However, others also suggested that specific reference to other ecosystems should be included.

### *Numeric aspects*

54. The proposed 20% restoration of degraded ecosystems is based on scientific research suggesting it would be feasible (for example one study showed that up to 55 per cent of converted land could be restored while maintaining current agricultural production if existing yield gaps could be closed by 75 per cent). Also, Aichi Biodiversity Target 15 called for the restoration of at least 15 per cent of degraded ecosystems and therefore a 20 per cent Target represents a step wise increase in ambition. It is important to set an ambitious restoration target as restoring land creates numerous benefits in terms of food production, water regulation, climate, biodiversity and ecosystems, employment, infrastructure, and governance.

### *Questions for consideration by the Parties and stakeholders*

Do Parties prefer the use of an absolute number in this target, or is keeping a percentage more preferable? What effect would either alternative have on the expected outcome?

### *Suggestions*

55. Some commented on the use of “freshwater, marine and terrestrial ecosystems” in this target. For consistency and simplicity reasons, it may be desirable to use “land and sea areas” instead. We note that many wanted to name specific ecosystems here; however, our advice is to keep the text as simple as possible and we wish to remind Parties of the definition of land and sea areas we have used in the glossary - “it is understood that land and sea areas include all terrestrial and aquatic ecosystems, including freshwater biomes”.<sup>6</sup> In the light of this we would suggest an alternative wording of this target as included below.

**Alternative text:** Ensure that at least 20 per cent of degraded **land and sea areas** are under restoration, ensuring connectivity among them and focusing on priority ecosystems.

<sup>6</sup> See the Glossary, CBD/WG2020/3/3/Add.2

**Target 3**

**First draft:** Ensure that at least 30 per cent globally of land areas and of sea areas, especially areas of particular importance for biodiversity and its contributions to people, are conserved through effectively and equitably managed, ecologically representative and well-connected systems of protected areas and other effective area-based conservation measures, and integrated into the wider landscapes and seascapes.

*What we heard*

56. Overall, we heard general support for this target. However some Parties questions if the 30% value was appropriate.

57. A number of Parties have mentioned the issue of the potential negative impact of this target on Indigenous people and local communities if not implemented with care.

*Numeric aspects*

58. It should be noted that the 30% value is supported by a range of scientific evidence, including by a detailed analysis of the cost, benefits and economic implications. This target is also supported by the 72 Parties members of the High Ambition Coalition.

*Question for consideration by the Parties and stakeholders*

What would be an alternate numerical value to use in this target?

*Suggestions*

59. The 30% target should be looked at as a global objective and it is understood that it may be more difficult to achieve in countries that have less landmass and have already undergone extensive development. It is useful to keep in mind that objective is not to prevent all activity within the 30% of land and sea areas. Areas that fall under the wider category of Other Effective area-based Conservation Measures allow for some types of economic activities, as long as the areas in question is managed to provide biodiversity benefits. As such, Parties would not necessarily be forgoing the opportunity to provide for all the needs of their populations, but will rather be required to plan carefully and manage appropriately the areas that fall under this target. Further, this target should be considered in the context of targets 1 and 2, which will ensure the complementarity of actions (see following graph for an illustration of this relationship).

60. The way this target, like for several others, is implemented can affect negatively or positively indigenous people and local communities. As such, it is recommended that this be addressed in the proposed “Guidance for the implementation of the framework” section.

61. Finally, we would like to emphasize that protecting 30% of lands and oceans by 2030 will not be sufficient to achieve the 2050 vision. While addressing the land and sea-use change is critical, protected areas on their own are not sufficient to reach the 2050 Vision.

*Alternative text*

62. As noted elsewhere in this document several Parties has expressed a preference to use the term ecosystem services, as opposed to nature’s contributions to people throughout the Framework. As such, the text of this target could be revised as follows.

Ensure that at least 30 per cent globally of land areas and of sea areas, especially areas of particular importance for biodiversity and **the provision of ecosystem services**, are conserved through effectively and equitably managed, ecologically representative and well-connected systems of protected areas and other effective area-based conservation measures, and integrated into the wider landscapes and seascapes.

**Target 4**

**First draft** – Ensure active management actions to enable the recovery and conservation of species and the genetic diversity of wild and domesticated species, including through ex situ conservation, and effectively manage human-wildlife interactions to avoid or reduce human-wildlife conflict.

*What we heard*

63. There was general support for this target. However, comments were made regarding the inclusion of “human-wildlife interactions” in this target versus in targets 5 or 9. There were also suggestions to include the term “in situ”. Some Parties also suggested that issues related to DSI could be addressed under this target.

*Numeric aspects*

64. This target does not reference an explicit numeric value. Nonetheless, the intention to “ensure active management” to achieve the objectives of “recovery and conservation” and “avoid/avoiding and reduce/reducing human-wildlife conflict” are clear indications of the actions that are required and the results that are expected.

*Questions for consideration by the Parties and stakeholders*

- (a) Should domesticated species and cultivated and harvested plants be included as part of this target?
- (b) In which target would it be most appropriate to refer to the issue of “human-wildlife conflict”?

*Suggestions*

65. This target was added in the updated zero draft pursuant to a request for a species conservation target that could capture all actions for species conservation and recovery not captured elsewhere in the framework.

66. Human-wildlife conflict is an important factor both contributing to biodiversity loss and impacting negatively human wellbeing, particularly that of indigenous peoples and local communities, and as such addressing it should be included in the Framework. Human-wildlife conflict could be placed in several possible locations within the framework. The original placement under target 4 was based on the intent for this target to address issues that affect biodiversity at the species level that are not addressed elsewhere in the framework. Of course, there are two natural alternatives: targets 5 and 9. With regard to target 5, which has as a focus the harvesting, trade and use of wildlife species, the Co-Chairs did not think this target would be a good fit to include human-wildlife conflict, as it could give the impression that conflict would be the result of harvest, trade and use, which would be limiting (conflict can arise for various reasons, such as the encroachment of human settlements into wildlife habitat). The other alternative of placing human wildlife-conflict in target 9 was equally problematic as less accurate. The focus of target 9 is meeting people’s needs, which may give the wrong impression that human-wildlife conflict is an issue for humans and does not have significant consequences for the populations of species that are significantly impacted. Parties should consider those various alternatives.

67. Regarding the requests to refer to and address DSI, given that a separate DSI process is ongoing, the Co-Chairs would wait for that formal process to conclude, before reflecting the appropriate changes here.

*Alternative text*

68. Several Parties commented that “in situ conservation” is missing from this target. The original suggestion to only refer to “ex situ conservation” was based on the assumption that the importance of “in situ conservation” would be understood implicitly. However, for clarity, the target could be revised as follows:

**Alternative text:** Ensure active management actions to enable the recovery and conservation of species and the genetic diversity of wild and domesticated species, including through **in situ and ex situ** conservation, and effectively manage human-wildlife interactions to avoid or reduce human-wildlife conflict.

### Target 5

**First draft** - Ensure that the harvesting, trade and use of wild species is sustainable, legal, and safe for human health.

#### *What we heard*

69. Parties expressed various concerns on the definition of the terms “sustainable, legal and safe” in this target.

#### *Numeric aspects*

70. This target does not have an explicit numeric value.

#### *Question for consideration by the Parties and stakeholders*

Should the focus of this target be about ensuring trade is legal rather than the elimination of illegal trade?

#### *Suggestions*

71. Based on the views expressed, we suggest addressing problematic activities, such as illegal trade, which could be achieved through better regulation and would result in ensuring the legality of permitted trade. Regarding the use of the term “safe” (or unsafe), we understand that many are concerned about it only relating to human health. By removing “for human health”, we would broaden the scope to include genetic, species, ecosystem and human health, implicitly broadening the scope of the target so that it better aligns with the One Health approach. Given these points we would suggest that the proposed target could be rephrased along the lines outlines below.

**Alternative text: Eliminate unsustainable, illegal and unsafe harvesting, trade and use of wild species.**

### Target 6

**First draft** - Manage pathways for the introduction of invasive alien species, preventing, or reducing their rate of introduction and establishment by at least 50 per cent, and control or eradicate invasive alien species to eliminate or reduce their impacts, focusing on priority species and priority sites.

#### *What we heard*

72. We heard general support for this target, however many suggested that reference to the identification of invasive alien species should also be included. Views were also expressed on the appropriateness of the 50% figure.

#### *Numeric aspects*

73. There is no evidence of slowing in the rate of invasion, at least for unintentional introductions linked to travel and trade. Indeed, the projected growth in shipping, could increase the risk of invasions by between 3 and 20 times by 2050 unless shipping mediated vectors are strongly mitigated. This underscores the importance of instruments to prevent the introduction of invasive alien species. Further, a recent assessment has projected that the number of established invasive alien species per continent is expected to increase by 36% between 2005 and 2050, while one sixth of global land area and 16 per cent of global biodiversity hotspots are highly vulnerable to invasion. To achieve the 2050 Vision and the proposed Goals of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework it will be necessary to limit the spread and impact of

invasive alien species. This requires limiting new introductions and eradicating or controlling those invasive alien species that pose a significant risk for threatened species or the provision of ecosystem services. A 50% reduction in the rate introduction and establishment of invasive alien species would be a first step towards this.

*Questions for consideration by the Parties and stakeholders*

Rather than using a percentage in this target, should the phrase “significantly decrease” be used instead? To what extent can progress towards this target be measured?

*Suggestions*

74. Given the comments above, we would suggest including “identify” in this target. We also note that international cooperation will be particularly important for the successful implementation of this target.

**Alternative text: Identify and** manage pathways for the introduction of invasive alien species, preventing, or reducing their rate of introduction and establishment by at least 50 per cent, and control or eradicate invasive alien species to eliminate or reduce their impacts, focusing on priority species and priority sites.

**Target 7**

**First draft** - Reduce pollution from all sources to levels that are not harmful to biodiversity and ecosystem functions and human health, including by reducing nutrients lost to the environment by at least half, and pesticides by at least two thirds and eliminating the discharge of plastic waste.

*What we heard*

75. We heard general support for the references to “eliminating the discharge of plastic waste” and “pollution from all sources”. We also heard different perspectives on “biocides” and “pesticides”. We also heard a number of suggestions to reflect different types of pollution in this target.

*Numeric aspects*

76. According to the United Nations Environment Programme, human activities produce around 120 m tonnes of reactive nitrogen each year, much of which (nearly two thirds) ends up polluting air, water, soil marine and coastal areas, and adding harmful gases to the atmosphere. Similarly, some 20 m tonnes of phosphorous are mined every year and nearly half enters the world’s oceans - 8 times the natural rate of input. As such, dead zones in the world’s oceans have increased from 10 cases in 1960 to 405 documented cases in 2008 and many of the world’s freshwater lakes, streams, and reservoirs suffer from eutrophication (millions of people depend on wells for their water where nitrate levels are well above recommended levels). This target proposes the reduction in nutrients loss by 50% (i.e. amount of nutrient not used in crop control and ending up in effluent or impacting insectivore nutrition) has been proposed under the Colombo Declaration. Further, case studies suggest that such a reduction would be feasible. Regarding the proposed reduction in pesticide use, empirical evidence from a range of crops and regions shows that, in many systems, pesticide use can be reduced by between 20% and 70% without reducing yields or farmer income when accompanied by appropriate agronomic practices.

77. Finally, this target proposes eliminating the discharge of plastic waste, rather the elimination of all plastic waste. The intent is to promote recycling and a more circular economy, to avoid additional contributions to the nearly 12 million tonnes of plastics being discharged into the oceans annually resulting in significant damage to marine and other life forms. Parties and Stakeholders should keep in mind that those numerical elements are in line with the recommendations of the Subsidiary Body on Scientific, Technical and Technological Advice.

*Questions for consideration by the Parties and stakeholders*

Would Parties prefer to keep separate numerical elements for pesticides and nutrients in this target? How might that affect the measurability of progress and what levels of reduction should we aim for? Should

other types of pollution be mentioned in the target? If so which ones and how would their inclusion effect the complexity of the target?

### *Suggestions*

78. Regarding the questions raised on what constitutes a pesticide, the Glossary includes a definition of the term pesticides, which broadly covers “any substance, or mixture of substances of chemical or biological ingredients intended for repelling, destroying or controlling unwanted live organisms”.

79. Regarding nutrients, it is useful to clarify the distinction between a reduction in nutrients use versus a reduction in nutrients lost to the environment. The objective of this target is not to reduce the use of nutrients where they are being used efficiently, but rather to reduce the inefficient use of them (i.e. too much is being used, they are being used at the wrong times and/or they are being applied in inefficient ways). The inefficient use of nutrients results in nutrients leaching into the environment, which can have serious impacts on species, air, water and soil quality, climate change and stratospheric ozone depletion. Moreover, it should be note that nutrients lost to the environment and nutrient effluents are two different concepts, with the latter being understood as a by-product of wastewater treatment. Whether Parties want to include nutrient effluent in this target should be considered. Having said all this, it is important to recall that reducing pesticide and nutrients use should be complemented by other actions to reduce pollution, including a transition to a more circular economy and agro-ecology.

80. Lastly, Parties may wish to consider if additional sources of pollution (e.g. noise and light pollution) should be referenced in this target. In the proposal, we provided our aim was to refer to the three priority substances, as identified in the IPBES assessment, and keep the target simple. Other groups of pollutants could become the focus of efforts in subsequent global biodiversity frameworks and eventually all priority pollutants should be addressed by 2050. Also note that a component indicator related to underwater noise is proposed in the monitoring framework.

## **Target 8**

**First draft** - Minimize the impact of climate change on biodiversity, contribute to mitigation and adaptation through ecosystem-based approaches, contributing at least 10 GtCO<sub>2</sub>e per year to global mitigation efforts, and ensure that all mitigation and adaptation efforts avoid negative impacts on biodiversity.

### *What we heard*

81. We heard general support for a target that addresses climate change as a driver of biodiversity loss and many Parties noted the role biodiversity could play in mitigating and adapting to the impacts of climate change. Nonetheless, there were differing views on the merits of including a specific numeric value in this target, including different views on the type of metrics (proportional or absolute) and on the specific numeric value. Some cautioned against including a numerical value related to another convention. Some Parties also suggested that “nature-based solutions” should be included in this target. However, others were not in favour of including this term in the target. Some Parties also called for the inclusion of the concept of “resilience”.

82. Some Parties also called for the inclusion of the concept of “resilience” in this target and would welcome reflecting this addition in the next iteration of the framework, as it would recognise the important role that biodiversity plays in our planet’s resilience to climate change.

### *Numeric aspects*

83. Target 8 includes one numeric element based on the United Nations *Emissions Gap Report 2020*, which concluded that emissions need to be reduced by 32 GtCO<sub>2</sub>e for humanity to achieve the goal of halting climate change above 1.5°C. Further to this conclusion, a report by the IUCN and Oxford University suggests that nature-based solutions could provide around 30% of the cost-effective mitigation that is needed by 2030 to stabilise warming to below 2°C. As such, the 10Gt GtCO<sub>2</sub>e value was derived by calculating 30% of 32 GtCO<sub>2</sub>e.

*Questions for consideration by the Parties and stakeholders*

- (a) Should nature-based solutions be re-inserted in this target?
- (b) Do Parties want to measure/ evaluate biodiversity's contributions to climate change mitigation (i.e. should this target contain a numerical aspect)?

*Suggestions*

84. Regarding the suggestion to include the term “nature-based solutions” in this target, we would like to note that the version of this target included in the zero draft presented to the Working Group at its the second meeting, contained this term. However, following the discussions at the meeting, we suggested a formulation of the target which omitted it and instead used ecosystem-based approaches. We also note that there are different definitions of nature-based solutions and that there are ongoing discussions on this issue in other forums.

85. In order to resolve the issue of “nature-based solution” vs. “ecosystem-based approach” it may be useful to first clarify and agree on their definitions. Below is a proposal:

IUCN Definition of “nature-based solutions” (NBS): Actions to protect, sustainably manage, and restore natural or modified ecosystems, that address societal challenges effectively and adaptively, simultaneously providing human well-being and biodiversity benefits;

The ecosystem-based approach (EbA), is an environmental management approach that primarily relies on the use of biodiversity and ecosystem services as part of an overall strategy to help people realize a benefit (climate or others). EbA requires working with nature, on the principle of sustainable management, conservation and restoration of ecosystems

This discussion is also ongoing in the context of the UNFCCC negotiations.

86. Some Parties are concerned with the inclusion of the term “nature-based solutions” in this target due to their concerns that the widespread use of NBS could result in negative impacts on biodiversity. It may be useful to keep in mind that the IUCN definition does include a reference to “providing biodiversity benefits”. Nonetheless, it is conceivable that there might be NBS applications that could result in less optimal outcomes for biodiversity (e.g. monoculture tree planting).

**Target 9**

**First draft:** Ensure benefits, including nutrition, food security, medicines, and livelihoods for people especially for the most vulnerable through sustainable management of wild terrestrial, freshwater and marine species and protecting customary sustainable use by indigenous peoples and local communities.

*What we heard*

87. There was general support for a target on this issue. However, many Parties suggested textual changes (e.g. additions or substitutions). Some Parties also suggested that this target should have a specific reference to the marine environment.

*Numeric aspects*

88. This target does not contain a numeric value and is more aspirational in nature. However, the intent of this target is to guarantee the appropriate management of species to meet people's needs, including the needs of indigenous peoples and local communities for their customary sustainable use.

*Questions for consideration by the Parties and stakeholders*

- (a) Should this target refer to exploitation of marine species or fisheries?
  - (b) What are the different elements of targets 5, 9, 10 and 11? Could any of these be merged?
- How does that impact the desired rebalancing of the three objectives of the Convention?

*Suggestions*

89. It may be useful to further consider the relationship between this target and targets 5, 10 and 11. Targets 9, 10 and 11 focus on actions to address Nature's contributions to people, while, target 5 address overexploitation as a cause of biodiversity loss. It is hoped that the proposed new wording of target 5 clarifies this. Then, considering the relationship between targets 9, 10 and 11. Target 9 focuses on the contribution of individual species to people, primarily as food, target 10 focuses on the use of ecosystem contributions to food and fibre and Target 11 focuses on other ecosystem services.

*Alternative text*

90. The alternative text below is intended to address the concerns expressed, as well as to simplify the target and make it easier to communicate.

Ensure the sustainable use of species (including fisheries) thereby providing benefits [including nutrition, food security, medicines, and livelihoods], to [all] people, especially to the most vulnerable [while safeguarding the sustainable customary use by indigenous peoples and local communities].

**Target 10**

**First draft:** Ensure all areas under agriculture, aquaculture and forestry are managed sustainably, in particular through the conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity, increasing the productivity and resilience of these production systems.

*What we heard*

91. Parties were generally supportive of this target there were a number of textual suggestions. We also note that a number of Parties would like to see agro-ecology reflected into this target. Some Parties also called for the inclusion of the concept of "resilience".

*Numeric aspects*

92. This target does not contain a numeric value; however, the reference to "all areas" in itself speaks to the need for comprehensive sustainable management of the three productive sectors mentioned. The decision to cover "all areas" is in response to the need for urgent transformational change and is based on the IPBES report, which identified land and sea use change as the most important driver of biodiversity loss. Further, a value of X% under sustainable management would imply that the remaining area could be managed unsustainably.

*Questions for consideration by the Parties and stakeholders*

- (a) Do Parties see the proposed actions under this target as a necessary precondition to achieving the 2050 Vision?
- (b) What percentage would be realistically achievable between now and 2030?

*Suggestions*

93. A successful global biodiversity framework will need to consider externalities (or indirect drivers), like global population growth. Practically, if food demand increases (due to the global population increasing and poverty eradication) the global biodiversity framework should take this into account. This can be achieved in two complementary ways. One way is to increase in the productivity of agriculture, aquaculture and forestry processes. The other is to change the consumption patterns which are addressed under proposed target 16.

94. The analysis of future pathways provided in the fifth edition of the *Global Biodiversity Framework*, drawing upon extensive literature, shows that increases in the productivity and sustainability of agriculture



will be needed alongside action on conservation and restoration and sustainable consumption. Better use of agricultural biodiversity within production systems can contribute to such increases.

95. Parties may also wish to consider the terminology of “ecological intensification” or “sustainable intensification” of the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations instead of productivity in this target.

96. When discussing this target Parties may also want to reflect on the overall balance and scope of targets 9, 10, 11, 12 and 13. For instance, some commented that fisheries should be included in this target. However, we note that target 9 is about the sustainable management of wild species (and hence the sustainable management of their ecosystems), which would include fisheries. On the other hand, target 10 is about productive ecosystems, as described above.

*Alternative text*

97. The alternative text below is intended to address the concerns expressed over the use of the term productivity.

**Alternative text:** Ensure all areas under agriculture, aquaculture and forestry are managed sustainably, in particular through the conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity, **contributing to** the ecological intensification and resilience of these production systems.

**Target 11**

**First draft:** Maintain and enhance nature’s contributions to regulation of air quality, quality and quantity of water, and protection from hazards and extreme events for all people.

*What we heard*

98. The views of Parties on this target mostly converge. The target aims to capture the remaining nature’s contributions/ecosystem services not reflected in targets 8, 9 and 10, although many would like to see minor modifications made to it. Some Parties expressed reservations regarding the use of the term “nature-based solutions”.

*Numeric aspects*

99. This is another target that uses relative terms to define the outcome of the required actions, (i.e. “maintain and enhance”). It would be challenging to quantify the degree of maintaining or enhancing nature’s contributions, as such a general direction of preserving or improving those contributions would be desirable.

*Suggestions of the Co-Chairs*

100. This is another target where the use of ecosystem services over the current wording (“nature’s contributions”) has been suggested. Further, many Parties support retaining “protection from hazards and extreme events”, which may become increasingly important in the context of more frequent disaster risks due to the effects of climate change. The mention of “protection from hazards and extreme events” is also an important element to emphasise here given the crucial role many well-functioning ecosystems play in mitigating and improving the resilience of our planet, cities and productive areas.

*Alternative text*

101. The alternative text below is intended to address the concerns expressed above.

**Alternative text:** Maintain and enhance ecosystem services for the regulation of air quality, quality and quantity of water, and protection from hazards and extreme events for all people.

**Target 12**

**First draft:** Increase the area of, access to, and benefits from green and blue spaces, for human health and well-being in urban areas and other densely populated areas.

*What we heard*

102. There is general support to have a target that aims to enhance the contribution of biodiversity for health and well-being of urban dwellers, particularly as an increase in the area and access to green and blue spaces for all urban dwellers; although, it appears that some Parties may have different views on the intent and the benefits provided by green and blue spaces.

103. Some desired to capture issues related to urban biodiversity (urban wildlife, habitat fragmentation and connectivity). Others wanted to capture the notions of sustainable urban development and spatial planning. There are also some who would like to include the broader issue of emergent zoonotic disease and the wider concept of “One Health”.

*Numeric aspects*

104. The draft target is about improving the quality, accessibility and increasing the area of green and blue spaces. It is suggestive of the direction of improvement. Some Parties have suggested a numerical target in term of ease of access measured in time (e.g. 20 min. walk). It should be noted that these improvements might not be possible in all urban and populated areas, as such implementation will be dependent on local circumstances.

*Question for consideration by the Parties and stakeholders*

105. Should the focus of this target be on area, quality and access to green and blue spaces in urban areas, should it be on conservation of biodiversity in urban areas, should it be on wider health benefits of biodiversity for urban dwellers, or should it be on wider sustainable development of cities? How far are these issues addressed within other targets? Where in the framework should other aspects of human health benefits of biodiversity or the broader “One Health” concept be captured?

106. Are issues urban expansion, habitat fragmentation, protected areas and spatial planning captured under targets 1, 2 and 3?

*Suggestions*

107. As the global population continues to increase over the next three decades, populated areas will become denser. Nature (ecosystem services) can contribute to urban dwellers’ wellbeing by improving the quantity and quality of green and blue areas and its access for people. What is more, the proposed outcomes, can be expected to provide other ancillary benefits for biodiversity and for human health and well-being. Green and blue areas provide benefits to humans, such as increased resilience to extreme weather events (e.g. floods, excessive heat), they provide various ecosystem services (e.g. clean water and air) and support the mental and physical health of people.

108. As mentioned previously, this target is not only about increasing the area of green and blue spaces, but also about improving their quality, i.e. to increase the benefits they provide it will, in many cases, be required to manage these areas more sustainably and intentionally and to restore past degradation. By 2050, 66 percent of the world’s population (an estimated 6.8 billion) will be living in cities and planning is needed to ensure that there is access to blue and green spaces for this increased population who will likely have no other access to or direct experience of nature due to distance to wild spaces.

**Target 13**

**First draft:** Implement measures at global level and in all countries to facilitate access to genetic resources and to ensure the fair and equitable sharing of benefits arising from the use of genetic resources, and as relevant, of associated traditional knowledge, including through mutually agreed terms and prior and informed consent.

*What we heard*

109. There is divergence on the following points:

(a) Scope of this target: Some suggested that it should be limited to the implementation of the Nagoya Protocol, while others suggested it should be broad and cover the obligations established under the Convention.

(b) Digital Sequence Information: There were different reviews expressed on whether Digital Sequence Information (DSI) should be referenced/addressed under this target or not.

(c) The fair and equitable sharing of the benefits arising out of the utilization of genetic resources: There were different views as to whether the third objective of the convention is reflected in a balanced manner in the global biodiversity framework.

*Numeric aspects*

110. This target does not have a specific numeric element. The implementation of global and national measures is intended to ensure a comprehensive outcome for fair and equitable sharing of benefits arising from utilization of genetic resources. Measures of progress can for example include the number Parties undertaking steps to implement.

*Questions for consideration by Parties and stakeholders*

(a) Should this target be solely directed at the Nagoya Protocol and its signatories? Conversely, given that this is a framework for all and ABS is one of the three objectives of the convention, should the focus be broader?

(b) To improve the balance between the three objectives of the convention, should the ABS target be split into its components to give them more emphasis? Alternatively, is it possible to address ABS comprehensively within one target?

*Suggestions*

111. On the scope of this target, it is important to note that, the framework is intended to be relevant for everyone. Parties should take into account that narrowing the scope of the target to only address the Nagoya Protocol, may make it difficult for Parties not currently party to the Nagoya Protocol to act on it.

112. Regarding the suggestion to refer to and address DSI, given that a separate DSI process is ongoing, Parties may wish to wait for that formal process to conclude, before deciding on if DSI should be reflected in this target. Furthermore, according to decision 14/20, paragraph 12, the Working Group is requested to consider the outcomes of the AHTEG on DSI and to make recommendations to the Conference of the Parties at its fifteenth meeting on how to address DSI in the context of the framework. It is the Co-Chairs' understanding that the request by the Conference of the Parties does not necessarily require the Working Group to include any reference to or address DSI within the framework – i.e. in connection or within the scope of any Goal or target. It could be sufficient for the Working Group to make recommendation to the Conference of the Parties at its fifteenth meeting on how DSI may be addressed, which includes (a) how to address DSI process wise, and/or (b) how to address it in terms of the substantive issues associated with it. However, the Working Group may also consider other options.

113. Section VI of this report addresses new target proposals. Parties should consider carefully the new ABS targets proposals and the elements they contain. However, Parties are also encouraged to consider the

value added of these proposed targets and weigh that against the arguments for keeping the framework simple and succinct.

114. Lastly, some identified a potential overlap between the objective of this target and the ongoing work under the United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea on the conservation and sustainable use of marine biological diversity of areas beyond national jurisdiction (BBNJ). The post-2020 global biodiversity framework and BBNJ should be seen as complementary processes. The Convention on Biological Diversity applies in different ways to areas within and beyond national jurisdiction as set out in its Article 4. The ABS regime under the Convention and the Nagoya Protocol applies within national jurisdiction and would be complemented by a regime set up for the high seas. The framework, as a universal framework, could provide an overarching target that facilitates synergies among all relevant instruments.

#### Target 14

**First draft:** Fully integrate biodiversity values into policies, regulations, planning, development processes, poverty reduction strategies, accounts, and assessments of environmental impacts at all levels of government and across all sectors of the economy, ensuring that all activities and financial flows are aligned with biodiversity values.

#### *What we heard*

115. We heard general support for this target. A number of Parties noted that biodiversity ought to be valued more and that its values should better reflect in various aspects of decision-making (i.e. policies, regulations, planning, development processes, poverty reduction strategies, accounts, and assessments of environmental impacts). However there were differing views on the interpretation of the word “values” given the multitude of value systems that exist. There were some concerns regarding the current wording of the target versus the earlier formulation, which referred to mainstreaming explicitly. Finally, there were comments about some of the terminology used, such as “financial flows” and “aligned with biodiversity values”.

#### *Numeric aspects*

116. This target features absolute objectives, (i.e. fully integrate, at all levels and all activities) which highlight the emphasis on the urgent need to incorporate biodiversity considerations into decision-making. This target is in a way very similar to Target 1, which speaks to “ensur(ing) that all land and sea areas globally are under integrated biodiversity-inclusive spatial planning”, as both targets, at their core, are based on the notion that to achieve the 2050 Vision of living in harmony with nature, every decision going forward needs to be based on appropriate and relevant assessment of the short and long-term costs, benefits and trade-offs for biodiversity and the provision of ecosystem services to meet people’s needs.

#### *Suggestions*

117. This target was designed together with targets 15 and 16. Target 14 focus on the actions of governing entities, Target 15 on the action of economic actors and Target 16 on the actions of individuals or citizens.

118. On the use of the word mainstreaming in this target it should be noted that that targets 14-21 all relate to mainstreaming (and hence the section heading). Mainstreaming requires a comprehensive approach, as such, it would not be appropriate to single out a single target as “the mainstreaming target”. In addition, translation of the target into all official languages of the United Nations was factored into the decision to avoid the use of “mainstreaming” in this target, as it is understood that an equivalent term may not exist in all of the other languages.

119. On the use of the term “values”, the use here is consistent with Aichi Biodiversity Target 2 which called for biodiversity values to be integrated into various planning, accounting and accounting, processes as appropriate and was in turn reflected in the SDGs (Target 15.9). The term “values” is intended to capture the diverse values of biodiversity and opportunities derived from its conservation and sustainable use are

recognized. Some of these multiple values can be quantified terms and while others are more abstract. To better capture the multiple values of biodiversity and to respond to the concerns raised, the proposed “Guidance for the implementation of the Framework” section of the framework could acknowledge different value systems.

*Questions for consideration by Parties and stakeholders*

Some Parties made comments regarding the use of “financial flows”, should the term “investments” be used instead? What is the intention of the phrase “financial flows” (i.e. shouldn't it broadly cover taxes, incentives and others)? Should the use of “financial flows” be used in Goal D?

*Alternative text*

The alternative text below is intended to address the concerns expressed.

**Alternative text:** Fully integrate biodiversity and its multiples values into policies, regulations, planning, development processes, poverty reduction strategies, accounts, and assessments of environmental impacts at all levels of government and across all sectors of the economy, ensuring that all activities and financial flows are aligned with the goals of the global biodiversity framework.

**Target 15**

**First draft** - All businesses (public and private, large, medium and small) assess and report on their dependencies and impacts on biodiversity, from local to global, and progressively reduce negative impacts, by at least half and increase positive impacts, reducing biodiversity-related risks to businesses and moving towards the full sustainability of extraction and production practices, sourcing and supply chains, and use and disposal.

*What we heard*

- (a) Parties generally support this target although, some were concerned that they did not see a clear role for governments.
- (b) Some Parties commented that this target is instead more outcome oriented.
- (c) Some Parties wanted to add a reference to the Task Force on Nature risk Disclosure (TNFD).
- (d) Parties proposed various further additions, such as of circular economy, disclosure, alignment with nature positive economy, and a mention of the Taskforce on Nature-related Disclosures (TNFD).

*Numeric aspects*

120. The rate at which progress is made under this target will depend on what Parties see as realistic and feasible. The proposed target makes three references to quantitative elements, “all businesses”, “by at least half” and “full sustainability”. Parties may wish to reflect on the level the ambition, for instance by introducing the “completely eliminating negative impacts”. Most importantly, early progress (i.e. by 2030) will lead to cumulatively better outcomes by 2050.

*Questions for consideration by Parties and stakeholders*

- (a) Should this target be aimed (mainly) at businesses or (mainly) at governments?
- (b) Is it possible to read this target as laying out the required actions by businesses, both mandated and voluntary while asking requiring governments to set in place the enabling environment?

*Suggestions*

121. This target should be considered in conjunction with targets 14 and 16, where target 15 focuses on the role and contributions of (socio-) economic actors (Target 14 focuses on the role of governments as policy makers' entities, and target 16 on the role of individuals as consumers).

122. As explained above, the logic behind the formulation of the targets was that they ought to be action oriented. Given this, the next iteration of the target could refer to enabling businesses to assess and report. Further, this would, as requested by several Parties, put the onus to take action on governments.

123. Further, to simplify the target, the deletion of “public and private, large, medium and small” may be considered. If circular economy is used it could replace “sourcing and supply chain and use and disposal)

124. Some commented that a reference to access and benefit sharing (ABS) may fit well into this target. However, we believe it is advisable that ABS remain under target 13, to avoid mixing up the different intent and outcomes.

125. Finally, some were concerned with the inclusion of small business in this target. Parties should reflect on whether businesses of varying sizes can be expected to meet the same requirements, as well as whether the proposed language allows for sufficient flexibility in the approaches business of various sizes are treated.

## Target 16

**First draft** - Ensure that people are encouraged and enabled to make responsible choices and have access to relevant information and alternatives, taking into account cultural preferences, to reduce by at least half the waste and, where relevant the overconsumption, of food and other materials.

### *What we heard*

(a) Overall, there is general support for this this target, but similarly to other targets, there were various suggestions for improvements;

(b) In particular, we heard significant support for the inclusion of the Sustainable Consumption concept (or, conversely, the elimination of unsustainable consumption) in this target. There were some reservations expressed with regard to the concept of “overconsumption;”

(c) Some Parties suggested the inclusion of “food security”.

### *Numeric aspects*

126. This target refers to one quantitative element, “reduce by at least half” for both waste and (where relevant) overconsumption. This is another instance that requires Parties to consider what is feasible versus what is an ambitious objective that positions the world on track to achieve the 2050 Vision.

### *Questions for consideration by Parties and stakeholders*

(a) Should this target refer to “progressively reduce and eliminate” waste instead?

(b) Does sustainable consumption have an impact on “waste (reduction)”?

### *Suggestions*

127. Regarding the potential to reference “food security” in this target, it might be more appropriate to leave that out to target 9. In a similar vein, it might be useful to clarify that target 16 is about individual citizen choices, and that its scope is not limited to consumption. In a complementary way, targets 10 and 15 address sustainable production.

128. Finally, some wanted to see more specificity in this target vis-a-vis the types of waste to be reduced. In line with our earlier comments on the desired level of detail, Parties are invited to amend the list, yet should keep in mind that the target ought to remain as simple as possible and to consider that specific aspects of achieving waste reduction, and of sustainable consumption more generally, could also be picked up at indicator level, in the monitoring framework.

### *Alternative text*

The alternative text below is intended to mainly address the Sustainable Consumption concept.

**Alternative text:** Ensure that people are encouraged and enabled to **adopt sustainable consumption** by improving access to relevant information and alternatives, taking into account cultural preferences, to reduce by at least half the waste and, where relevant the overconsumption, of food and other materials.

### Target 17

**First draft** - Establish, strengthen capacity for, and implement measures in all countries to prevent, manage or control potential adverse impacts of biotechnology on biodiversity and human health, reducing the risk of these impacts.

#### *What we heard*

129. There are discussions on the scope of this target, with some arguing that it should be limited to biotechnology as per the scope of the Cartagena protocol, while others argue that the scope of the target should be broader.

130. Further, some Parties commented that this target should also speak to the benefits from biotechnology and not be limited to its risks.

#### *Numeric aspects*

131. This target aims at ensuring that countries have put in place effective measures with the aim to “prevent, manage and control potential adverse impacts” through the establishment, the strengthening of capacity for, and implementation of measures. The qualitative element here is critical, Parties will need to determine how to: manage biotechnology, and invest in capacity-building within their borders, cooperate effectively, as well as support developing countries.

#### *Questions for consideration by Parties and stakeholders*

(a) Should the order of the targets be rearranged, moving this target up immediately following 13, especially if a benefit sharing element is added (i.e. it would fall under the heading “Meeting people’s needs through sustainable use and benefit-sharing”)?

(b) Would it be better to keep a target with a broader scope, which could do more by committing everyone, rather than limiting those who will take action to the signatories of the Cartagena Protocol?

#### *Suggestions*

132. Regarding the potential addition of a reference to the benefits from biotechnology, we would like to note that while the Cartagena Protocol does not address the promotion of benefits from biotechnology, Article 19 of the Convention explicitly addresses biotechnology benefits.<sup>7</sup> The potential benefits of biotechnology could also be reflected in targets 9 or 10.

133. Parties should keep in mind that Biotechnology is addressed in several provisions of the Convention on Biological Diversity, including in Article 8(g), which requires Parties, as far as possible and appropriate, to establish or maintain means to regulate, manage or control the risks associated with the use and release of living modified organisms resulting from biotechnology 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.

---

<sup>7</sup> Article 19.2 states that Each Contracting Party shall take all practicable measures to promote and advance priority access on a fair and equitable basis by Contracting Parties, especially developing countries, to the results and benefits arising from biotechnologies based upon genetic resources provided by those Contracting Parties. Such access shall be on mutually agreed terms.”

**Target 18**

**First draft** - Redirect, repurpose, reform or eliminate incentives harmful for biodiversity, in a just and equitable way, reducing them by at least US\$ 500 billion per year, including all of the most harmful subsidies, and ensure that incentives, including public and private economic and regulatory incentives, are either positive or neutral for biodiversity.

*What we heard*

134. Some Parties questioned the numeric element and their ability to implement the target. Some Parties also questioned whether reducing or eliminating harmful subsidies should be part of the resource mobilization strategy.

*Numeric aspects*

135. The numerical element in this target is based on analyses by the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD). Based on these analyses, the value of subsidies that are harmful or potentially harmful to biodiversity is conservatively estimated at about US\$ 500 billion per year, with the most harmful subsidies including government support to agriculture output and capacity-enhancing subsidies for fishing fleets.

136. Clearly, Parties will have to evaluate what is feasible in a just and equitable context.

*Suggestions*

137. As outlined under goal D, the proposed objective is to have sufficient resources to cover all cost as soon as possible. This can be through a combination of cost reduction (by way of a reduction of harmful subsidies) in this target and increasing resource available (target 19). Reducing harmful subsidies will result in a direct reduction of the cost of addressing biodiversity loss by minimizing damage in the first place. The faster and the further costs can be decreased, the earlier the financing gap can be closed.

138. Financial studies estimate that it is not realistic to expect that gap could be fully closed by 2030. However, it is estimated that between subsidies reduction (to the amount of 500,000) and an increase in resources available (from current levels up to 200,000), the gap can be reduced by 700,000. This is an important message of the CBD expert panel on resource mobilization and of the recent report of the Paulson Institute.<sup>8</sup> The faster and the further these reductions happen, the larger the diminution of the costs will be.

139. Furthermore, if the subsidies can be redirected and repurposed to support biodiversity positive activities, this positive impact could be multiplied: e.g., repurposing agriculture subsidies away from inducing more production to payment for ecosystem services, both decreases costs (e.g. addressing pesticide loss impact) and increases contributions (increase habitat for wildlife), with no net cost from a treasury perspective. Admittedly, there would be costs associated with transition. Further, the target is directed at the most harmful subsidies, as such, Parties are not expected to eliminate or reform all harmful subsidies by 2030. Finally, with the inclusion of the proposed section on guidance for implementation, explained above, the implementation of this target would continue to be “consistent and in harmony with the Convention and other relevant international obligations, taking into account national socio-economic conditions”, as has been the wording of Aichi Biodiversity Target 3.

*Questions for consideration by Parties and stakeholders*

(a) What level of reduction and elimination of harmful subsidies would be considered feasible by Parties?

<sup>8</sup> CBD/SBI/3/5/Add.2 and Deutz et al (2020). Financing Nature: closing the global biodiversity financing gap. The Paulson Institute, The Nature Conservancy, and the Cornell Atkinson Center for Sustainability.



(b) Should they be expressed as an annual level in 2030 or as cumulative amount over the duration of the framework? The latter option allowing to account for ramp-up over the early years.

(c) Should the order of targets 18 and 19 be reversed in order to strengthen the linkage between the two targets?

### Target 19

**First draft** - Increase financial resources from all sources to at least US\$ 200 billion per year, including new, additional and effective financial resources, increasing by at least US\$ 10 billion per year international financial flows to developing countries, leveraging private finance, and increasing domestic resource mobilization, taking into account national biodiversity finance planning, and strengthen capacity-building and technology transfer and scientific cooperation, to meet the needs for implementation, commensurate with the ambition of the goals and targets of the framework.

#### *What we heard*

140. All Parties are very aware that one of the main lessons learned from the Aichi Targets was that providing adequate financial resources is critical for the successful implementation of biodiversity targets. As such, the critical divergences are about the level of funding required, the appropriate “mix” of funding streams and sources, and the mechanism of provision of resources, including the opportunity to create a fund. Parties also spoke to the need for timely provision of resources, as they will need to take actions as soon as the framework is adopted.

#### *Numeric aspects*

141. There are several quantitative elements in this target and they require separate analysis.

142. The first element is to increase the availability of financial resource from all sources, bearing in mind recent assessments undertaken, such as the intermediate report of the panel of experts on resource mobilization and the report of the Paulson Institute and others, reflected in the former.<sup>9</sup> They estimate direct biodiversity conservation and recovery cost at \$200,000, as such, the first numeric element represents an increase to \$200,000 globally. The later element (“from all sources”) is useful, as it is unlikely that governments alone will have sufficient resources to cover all costs. We also note increased support from many Parties to factor environmental costs in economic flows.

143. Parties have agreed that developed countries should be assisting those that need financial support. While significant progress has been made, there is still a need to significantly increase financial assistance; an increase of \$10B roughly represents a doubling of support made available to developing countries. It is interesting to note that a number of recent financial commitments have already acknowledged this and are creating the requisite political momentum towards fulfilling this objective.

144. Parties should consider whether they prefer the use of percentages versus absolute numbers in this target. Furthermore, Parties may want to reflect on the use of terms such as “increase” or “doubling”. Also, a consideration should be given to the basis of quantitative aspects, i.e. for the decade (by 2030) versus per year.

145. With regard to funding mechanisms, such as the recent announcement by China of the establishment of a Kunming Biodiversity Fund, this should be recognized and taken into account, though perhaps, in line with our earlier reasoning concerning level of granularity, not in the framework itself but, rather, in the decision by which the Conference of the Parties adopts the framework.

146. Finally, this target also speaks to the need to provide adequate non-monetary resources, such as contributions to capacity-building, technology transfer and scientific cooperation. There are significant gaps

<sup>9</sup> See CBD/SBI/3/5/Add.3. Early results of the analysis of the Paulson Institute and others (see para. 138) were reflected in this preliminary report, together with an analysis of methodological differences.

in developing countries and countries with economies in transition, in terms of non-monetary resources available to support the implementation of the framework. Further, the extent of these gaps is not well understood due to the lack of data. As such, efforts need to be made to continually increase the provision of such resources. Hence, the use of a qualitative element here is appropriate.

*Question for consideration by Parties and stakeholders*

- (a) What level of financial resources can be made available globally? How fast can the provision be ramped up?
- (b) What amount of the global funding should be directed to developing countries?
- (c) Should a new target that addresses non-financial resources be developed (i.e. splitting this target into two)?
- (d) If a new international financing instrument is to be created, should a reference be made to it in this Target?

*Suggestions*

147. Recent important financial commitments are a tangible recognition of the importance of making progress on this issue. Clearly, those are not yet sufficient, and, naturally, as negotiations progress, further commitments could be expected. The importance of this target cannot be overstated. While its formulation and numerical elements are important, Parties are also encouraged to make early and ambitious financial commitments. Such commitments will motivate others to make commitments of their own, driving the global ambition upwards, and providing assurance to developing countries that they will be supported throughout the implementation stages of the framework.

## Target 20

**First draft** - Ensure that relevant knowledge, including the traditional knowledge, innovations and practices of indigenous peoples and local communities with their free, prior, and informed consent, guides decision-making for the effective management of biodiversity, enabling monitoring, and by promoting awareness, education and research.

*What we heard*

148. We heard general support for this target and many noted that relevant knowledge is a prerequisite for the successful implementation of the Framework. Some Parties made comments regarding the use and scope of the term “knowledge”, questioning whether it encompasses various knowledge, belief and value systems. Further, many spoke to the important role of education and public awareness.

149. A number of Parties also mentioned the need for Parties and stakeholders to have easy and timely access to the relevant information, knowledge, and experience required to implement the framework.

*Numeric aspects*

150. This target does not contain a numerical element, but rather speaks to the actions required to achieve informed “decision-making and effective management of biodiversity”. This target has direct links to the scope of target 1 on spatial planning, target 14 on integrating biodiversity values in decision-making, and Target 16 on responsible choices. The actions to be taken to reach all of these targets would require relevant information. However, having the relevant knowledge is the basis for making good decisions and has implications for all targets of the framework. For instance, all references to sustainable management (e.g. targets 9 and 10) would require a prior understanding of the functioning of natural ecosystems and the impacts various actions would have on them.

### *Suggestions*

151. As we have heard from many about their concerns that the framework does not adequately reflect the parity between the various knowledge, belief and value systems, the proposed “Guidance for the implementation of the framework” section of the framework suggests acknowledging the equal merit and role of such systems. Moreover, this acknowledgement could serve as a foundational principle for the implementation of the framework in its entirety. Lastly, the aim is to resolve concerns with cross-cutting implications in the new “Guidance for the implementation of the framework” section, thus allowing the text of the goals and targets to be kept simple and succinct. However, it should be noted that the reference to “traditional knowledge, innovations and practices of indigenous peoples and local communities” should remain in this target for added emphasis.

152. With regard to the ease of access to information, the central clearing-house mechanism and its national nodes, as well as other biodiversity knowledge systems and networks could be strengthened.

### **Target 21**

**First draft** - Ensure equitable and effective participation in decision-making related to biodiversity by indigenous peoples and local communities, and respect their rights over lands, territories and resources, as well as by women and girls, and youth.

#### *What we heard*

153. We heard general support for this target. There is, however, a desire by some to have a separate target related to gender. As well, some Parties would like to see stronger languages ensuring that the rights of indigenous peoples and local communities over lands, territories and resources will be safeguarded.

#### *Numeric aspects*

154. There is no numerical aspect in this target, although, the intent is to guarantee (i.e. in 100% of cases) the participation of indigenous peoples and local communities, women, girls and youth. Further, the intent is also to guarantee (i.e. in 100% of cases) that the rights of indigenous peoples and local communities will be respected and safeguarded.

#### *Question for consideration by Parties and stakeholders*

Do Parties prefer to have a separate target related to gender?

### *Suggestions*

155. We heard many requests for the addition of references to indigenous peoples and local communities and women, girls and youth throughout the framework, as well as in specific targets. For instance, there were concerns that Target 3 could lead to the dispossession of indigenous peoples and local communities from the lands, territories and resources. The newly proposed “Guidance for the implementation of the Framework” section will make it clear that respecting the rights of indigenous peoples and local communities and providing opportunities for equitable and effective participation of indigenous peoples and local communities and women, girls and youth are foundational guidelines of the framework. Similarly, guidance related to the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples could also be referenced in the guidance for implementation section.

#### *Alternative text*

156. The following revisions to target 21 could be made in the next iteration of the framework to strengthen the language.

Ensure equitable, effective and **gender-sensitive** participation in decision-making related to biodiversity by indigenous peoples and local communities, and respect their rights over lands, territories and resources, as well as by women and girls, and youth.

## VI. PROPOSALS FOR NEW TARGETS

### *What we heard*

157. During discussions at the first part of the third meeting of the Working Group on the framework, we heard several proposals for new targets.

### *Reflections by the Co-Chairs*

158. Parties and stakeholders are encouraged to identify gaps in the current formulation on the Goals and Targets and to propose new ones to address such gaps. Parties are encouraged to consider the merits of these new targets and to provide support for them as appropriate.

159. A number of Parties suggested that it would be useful to have additional targets. The new target proposals, which can also be found in the annex to the report on the third meeting of the Working Group, were carefully considered. Below we address the new target proposals made during the meeting. Parties may wish to reflect on whether the proposals or elements of them have already been addressed in the targets under the framework (should those elements be made prominent instead?), with a view to keeping the framework short and communicable. For the most part, the proposals below would add further detail to the framework, but are not introducing completely new notions.

#### **Proposed in discussion on Target 4**

Ensure the conservation and sustainable use of cultivated and domesticated species for food and agriculture and their wild relatives, and maintain the genetic diversity through in situ and ex situ conservation.

160. The elements of this proposed target are generally covered under Goal A and target 4.

#### **Proposed in discussion on Target 5**

Implement One Health approaches, focusing especially on the risks of the emergence and transmission of zoonotic diseases, to avoid or reduce risks to the health of humans, wild and domesticated species, and ecosystems.

161. This proposal has a strong focus on health; however, there is a risk that other important aspects may be lost.

#### **Proposed in discussion on Target 5**

Ensure that illicit wildlife trafficking is reduced by at least X percent, and that adequate legal frameworks for strictly regulating wildlife trade and preventing and combating illicit wildlife trafficking are in place and effectively implemented.

162. This proposal is mostly a reformulation of Target 5. Parties should consider whether this proposal expressed better the intent of Target 5.

#### **Proposed in discussion on Target 9 (proposal to combine targets 5 and 9)**

Ensure that the harvesting, trade and use of wild terrestrial, freshwater and marine species is sustainable, legal, and safe for human health and customary sustainable use by indigenous peoples and local communities is protected to enhance benefits, including nutrition, food security, medicines, and livelihoods for people especially for the most vulnerable.

163. Parties are encouraged to consider whether merging targets 5 and 9 would allow the resulting target to remain SMART. Further merging the two targets may result in losing the balance in terms of the three objectives of the Convention. Finally, the two targets encompass different actions (see the reflections on target 9) and merging them would result in losing out on some of these actions, as such Parties should also consider that factor before making a decision on whether to merge the two.

**Proposed in discussion on T13**

1. Implement measures at global level and in all countries to facilitate access to genetic resources and to ensure the fair and equitable sharing of benefits arising from the **utilization use** of genetic resources. ~~and as relevant, of associated traditional knowledge, including through mutually agreed terms and prior and informed consent.~~
2. Implement measures at global level and in all countries ~~to facilitate access to genetic resources~~ to ensure the fair and equitable sharing of benefits arising from the ~~use of genetic resources, and as relevant, of associated~~ **utilization of traditional knowledge associated with** genetic resources, including through mutually agreed terms and prior and informed consent.
3. Establish and implement a mechanism to ensure the fair and equitable sharing of benefits arising from the utilization of digital sequence information on genetic resources.

164. Regarding this proposal, Parties should consider whether they prefer to split target 13? The main facts to reflect on are simplicity of the framework versus a balanced approach to the three objectives of the Convention.

165. As noted elsewhere in this report, given that the discussions related to DSI are ongoing, our suggestion is to await the resolution of the formal DSI process before revisiting this issue.

**Proposed in discussion on T13**

Additional target: Increase the fair and equitable sharing of benefits arising from the utilization of genetic resources, and as relevant, of associated traditional knowledge, proportionally to the growth rate of the economic sectors most reliant on the access and use of genetic resources, to contribute to the conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity, and establish and implement a global multilateral benefit-sharing mechanism to ensure the fair and equitable sharing of benefits arising from the utilization of digital sequence information on genetic resources.

166. The same comments as above is also applicable to this proposal.

**Proposed in discussion on T21**

Ensure women and girls equitable access and benefits from conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity, as well as their informed and effective participation at all levels of policy and decision making related to biodiversity.

167. It may be best to refer to women and girls in a single target or across the framework e.g. in the Principle sections? Parties should consider that while different groups would be concerned under those separate targets, the actions and outcomes would be similar. Further, it should be noted that gender is addressed throughout the framework, including in the front and back section (as well as in the proposed “Guidance for implementation of the framework” section), the monitoring framework.

**Proposed in discussion in CG3**

By 2030, ensure strengthened cooperation and enhance synergies among relevant multilateral environmental agreements, international organizations and programmes and thereby contributing to effective and efficient implementation of the biodiversity framework.

168. It should be noted that synergies are covered under section I, Enabling conditions. Further, it should be noted that the Convention cannot complete the proposed work on its own (i.e. the framework in not binding on other MEAs), as well if this target is included as part of the Framework, the Convention and Parties would be required to take part in monitoring and review of other MEAs, which would not be appropriate. It may be best for this issue too to be reflected as cross-cutting guidance.

**Proposed in discussion in CG3**

Take measures in the education and scientific sectors ensuring that by 2030 biodiversity and cultural diversity-specialized and transdisciplinary curricula and science/policy studies are fully operationalized and supported at all the levels, including primary, secondary, higher education, and related capacity-building and research training programs, taking into account: (a) the learning processes and knowledge systems of indigenous peoples and local communities as well as citizen science; (b) the human rights to free, inclusive, equitable and quality education, with special regard to women and marginalized social groups; (c) the need to integrate teaching/research/outreach activities in order to effectively impact on the ground and society and contribute to the implementation of biodiversity and sustainability policy.

169. Parties should consider whether the current text of target 20 covers the above aspects (e.g. education).

**VII. REFLECTIONS ON SECTIONS H TO K**

**Section H – Implementation support mechanisms**

**First draft** - 13. Implementation of the framework and achievement of its goals and targets will be supported through support mechanisms under the Convention on Biological Diversity, including the financial mechanism, and strategies for resource mobilization, capacity-building and development, technical and scientific cooperation and technology transfer, knowledge management as well as through relevant mechanisms under other conventions and international processes.<sup>10</sup>

*What we heard*

- (a) There was significant support for the elements contained in this section;
- (b) A number of proposals for additional elements were made. These proposals essentially expanded on the original text, emphasizing i.e. ways to significantly strengthen implementation. We note suggestions to add explicit references to further implementation support mechanisms such as the Long-term Approach on Mainstreaming biodiversity and the review mechanism. We also heard proposals to include detailed language from some of the ancillary products such as the resource mobilization strategy and the long-term Strategic framework for capacity development. Finally, there have been suggestions to include references to specific provisions of the Convention.

*Suggestions*

170. The post-2020 framework will be supported by a series of decisions of the Conference of the Parties, including on capacity-building, mainstreaming, cooperation, resource mobilization, among others. These decisions will serve to operationalize these ancillary products for Parties to the Convention. In the spirit of this being a framework for all and ensuring the framework remains communicable to actors outside the Convention on Biological Diversity – including subnational governments, the private sector and the whole-of-society – there may not be a need to reference these ancillary products extensively in the text of the post-2020 framework itself.

*Questions for consideration by Parties and stakeholders*

What level of detail should be imported from the ancillary products? Is it possible or desirable to list them all?

---

<sup>10</sup> This list will be updated when the elements are agreed.

**Section I – Enabling conditions**

**First draft** - 14. The implementation of the global biodiversity framework requires integrative governance and whole-of-government approaches to ensure policy coherence and effectiveness, political will and recognition at the highest levels of government.

15. It will require a participatory and inclusive whole-of-society approach that engages actors beyond national Governments, including subnational governments, cities and other local authorities (including through the Edinburgh Declaration), intergovernmental organizations, non-governmental organizations, indigenous peoples and local communities, women's groups, youth groups, the business and finance community, the scientific community, academia, faith-based organizations, representatives of sectors related to or dependent on biodiversity, citizens at large, and other stakeholders.

16. Efficiency and effectiveness will be enhanced for all by integration with relevant multilateral environmental agreements and other relevant international processes, at the global, regional and national levels, including through the strengthening or establishment of cooperation mechanisms.

17. Further, success will depend on ensuring greater gender equality and empowerment of women and girls, reducing inequalities, greater access to education, employing rights-based approaches, and addressing the full range of indirect drivers of biodiversity loss, as identified by the Global Assessment Report on Biodiversity and Ecosystem Services issued by the Intergovernmental Science-Policy Platform on Biodiversity and Ecosystem Services, including those not directly addressed by the goals and targets of the Framework, such as demography, conflict and epidemics, including in the context of the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development.

*What we heard*

171. Parties and supported stakeholders have made numerous proposals to increase the level of detail of this section including by making reference to a variety of processes and instruments and cross-cutting concepts related to cooperation, mainstreaming, One Health and rights-based approaches. Some of the time-bound processes and instruments referred to include the United Nations Decade on Ecosystems Restoration.

*Suggestions*

172. Section I was originally intended to identify the key enabling conditions to ensure the post-2020 framework is effectively implemented. Many of the elements reflected in Section I are proposed to be integrated into the proposed new section on guidance for implementation, such as ensuring that this is a framework for all (from para. 14), inclusivity and participation (including the list of actors and stakeholders from para. 15), integration/synergies (from para. 16), and gender and rights-based approaches (from para. 17). As for Section H above, many of the elements are also reflected elsewhere in the framework including in the goals and targets. To avoid duplication, Parties and stakeholders may therefore reconsider whether this section is still needed.

*Question for consideration by Parties and stakeholders*

What level of detail is appropriate for this section?



## Section J – Responsibility and transparency

**First draft - 18.** The successful implementation of the framework requires responsibility and transparency, which will be supported by effective mechanisms for planning, monitoring, reporting and review. Countries, Parties to the Convention, have a responsibility to implement mechanisms for planning, monitoring, reporting and review.<sup>11</sup> These mechanisms allow for transparent communication of progress to all, timely course correction and input in the preparation of the next global biodiversity framework, while minimizing the burden at the national and international levels, by:

- (a) Establishing national targets as part of national strategies and action plans and as contributions towards the achievement of the global targets;
- (b) Reporting national targets to enable the collation of national targets in relation to the global action targets, as needed, and their adjustment to match the global action targets;
- (c) Enabling the evaluation of national and collective actions against targets.

19. These mechanisms are aligned with and, where appropriate, complemented by national reporting under the Protocols and integrated with other processes and other relevant multilateral conventions including the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development and the Sustainable Development Goals.

20. The development of additional and complementary approaches is encouraged to allow other actors to contribute to the implementation of the framework and report on commitments and actions.

### *What we heard*

173. We heard a number of detailed text proposals that, if accepted in their entirety, would significantly expand the original text.

174. Some Parties added further precision to the envisaged planning, monitoring, reporting and review mechanisms, including detailed provisions to operationalize said mechanisms.

175. However, others appear to support the view that such detailed provisions should be included in the decision of the Conference of the Parties adopting the review mechanism which this section should cross-reference.

### *Reflections*

176. The zero draft (Section I) had a relatively short description of the key characteristics of the planning, reporting and review system. Discussions at the second meeting of the Working Group resulted in a number of requests to increase level of detail and precision.

177. At the third meeting of the Subsidiary Body on Implementation (item 9: mechanisms for reporting, assessment and review of implementation), many Parties stressed the importance of having a more robust system for planning reporting and review.

178. The updated zero draft (Section H) had a longer and more detailed description of the proposed elements of the planning, reporting and review mechanisms.

179. Considering the outcome of the deliberations of the Subsidiary Body on Implementation, the first draft went back to a shorter text (assuming that details specific to the Convention would be reflected in a separate decision of the Conference of the Parties) yet attempted to have more precise language regarding the key architectural characteristics of the system and on the roles, contributions and obligations of all involved entities.

---

<sup>11</sup> Parties to the Convention would have a responsibility to implement mechanisms for planning, monitoring, reporting and review as set out in decision 15/-. This will be developed on the basis of discussions under the Subsidiary Body on Implementation as reflected in CBD/SBI/3/CRP.5, taking into account also any inputs from the Working Group on the Post-2020 Global Biodiversity Framework.

*Suggestions*

180. Section J highlights the need, role and place of the mechanisms for planning, monitoring, reporting and review in the post-2020 framework. This renewed and stronger instrument is to be key to deliver transparency and responsibility. The language in the first draft highlights that it is the responsibility of Parties to implement such mechanisms, and sets out the principal elements these mechanisms should include (para. 18), their relationship with national reporting and integration with international processes (para. 19). Moreover, since this is a framework for all, paragraph 20 was specifically included as a way to engage actors formally outside the CBD process who would not be reporting under these mechanisms.

181. Parties and stakeholders may wish to recall that the review mechanism will be discussed at the resumed sessions of the Subsidiary Body on Implementation (under the agenda item on an enhanced monitoring, reporting and review mechanism) and in the resumed session of the Working Group.

182. At the January meeting in Geneva, Parties may want, first, to design the architecture and characters of the system and then, decide, which part should go into the global biodiversity framework and which should go in the draft decision for the Conference of the Parties emanating from the Subsidiary Body on Implementation.

183. In doing so, they should keep in mind that the framework is intended to be used by as many entities as possible, outside the Convention and that, therefore, characteristics and elements that are unique to the Convention may be better placed in the draft decision emanating from the Subsidiary Body on Implementation.

*Questions for consideration by Parties and stakeholders*

- (a) How detailed should this section be?
- (b) What level of detail on the provisions of the planning, reporting and review mechanism should be integrated into this section?
- (c) Should the Section remain high-level, that is addressed to a non-CBD audience?
- (d) Should the Section include a reference to the relevant decision of the Conference of the Parties adopting the review mechanism?

**Section K – Outreach, awareness and uptake**

**First draft - 21.** Outreach, awareness and uptake of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework by all stakeholders is essential to effective implementation, including by:

- (a) Increasing understanding, awareness and appreciation of the values of biodiversity, including the associated knowledge, values and approaches used by indigenous peoples and local communities;
- (b) Raising awareness of all actors of the existence of the goals and targets of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework and progress made towards their achievement;
- (c) Promoting or developing platforms and partnerships, including with media and civil society, to share information on successes, lessons learned and experiences in acting for biodiversity.

*What we heard*

184. Parties and supported stakeholders have constructively engaged with the original text and built on it by adding further detail. We also note the suggestion to add education and make communication more prominent in the text.

*Suggestions*

185. We suggest adding communication and education prominently in the text and the section header, replacing outreach with communication, which would be broader and may provide a better reference point

for the communications strategy being developed. We have proposed a text below that incorporates Parties and supported stakeholders' suggestions, with some editing to enhance readability.

*Alternative text*

### **K. Communication, education, awareness and uptake**

21. Enhancing communication, education, awareness and uptake of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework by all actors is essential to achieve its effective implementation and behavioural change, including by:

- (a) Increasing awareness, understanding and appreciation of the diverse values of biodiversity and ecosystems services, including associated traditional knowledge, approaches and cosmovisions used by indigenous peoples and local communities while ensuring their free, prior and informed consent, as well as of biodiversity's contribution to sustainable development;
- (b) Raising awareness among all actors of the need for urgent action to implement the post-2020 global biodiversity framework and enabling their active engagement in its implementation and in the monitoring of progress towards the achievement of its goals and targets;
- (c) Adapting the language used, level of complexity and thematic content to specific groups of actors, including by developing material that can be translated into indigenous languages;
- (d) Promoting or developing repositories, platforms, partnerships and action agendas, including with media, civil society and educational institutions, to share information on successes, lessons learned and experiences and to allow for adaptive learning in acting for biodiversity.
- (e) Integrating transformative education on biodiversity and cultural diversity into formal, non-formal and informal educational programmes, promoting values and behaviours that are consistent with living in harmony with nature.

## **VIII. REFLECTIONS ON THE MONITORING FRAMEWORK**

*Context*

186. It is useful to keep in mind the evolution of this document over time:

(a) The first draft of the monitoring framework was published in January 2020 as [CBD/WG2020/2/3/Add.1](#). This draft was aligned with the zero draft of the framework.

(b) A second draft of proposed indicators and monitoring approach was presented at the twenty-fourth meeting of the Subsidiary Body on Scientific, Technical and Technological Advice as [CBD/SBSTTA/24/3/Add.1](#). It was discussed in contact group and a survey was conducted. At that time, Parties asked for the develop of a new version of the Monitoring Framework

(c) The third draft of the monitoring framework was published in July 2021 as [CBD/WG2020/3/3/Add.1](#) in preparation for part 1 of the third meeting of the Working Group. This draft used the outcome of the in-session survey from the Subsidiary Body on Scientific, Technical and Technological Advice and was restructured to align with the new first draft of the framework. At that time, the Bureau of the Conference of the Parties requested the preparation of an update of the monitoring framework to be published six weeks in advance of the resumed sessions of the third meeting of the Working Group.

*Reflections by the Co-Chairs*

187. While this last draft of the monitoring framework was not discussed in detail, during the first part of the third meeting of the Working Group, a limited number of Parties did express views on various aspects related to indicators and the monitoring framework. In addition, many countries refrained from making comments on the monitoring framework. While those comments will be considered for the updated version of the monitoring framework, the following summarizes the questions and views that emerged from the meeting and offer some reflections.

188. There was general support for a tiered approach to indicators (Headline, Component and supplementary indicators).

189. Regarding the headline indicators:

(a) There seems to be general support for the establishment of a list of headline indicators to be used consistently at the national and global levels, to the extent possible;

(b) A number of Parties emphasized that the headline indicators should be based on national data sources and national data systems, to the extent possible;

(c) However, there is as yet no common understanding of every aspect of this category of indicators.

190. There is a range of views on the need for consistency and comprehensiveness in the use of the three categories of indicators for planning and reporting documents, according to a schedule agreed to by all Parties.

191. Parties noted that it would be necessary to ensure that adequate resources are made available at both the national and Convention level to enable the effective implementation of the monitoring framework.

192. Some Parties felt that the number of headline indicators should be fewer than what is currently proposed in document CBD/WG2020/3/3/Add.1, while other Parties felt there is a need for the list of headline indicators to capture the main concepts for each goal and target, in order to allow monitoring across every aspect of the framework.

193. As such, it may be useful to understand the rationale behind the various positions on this issue. Regarding the points we heard, below are two factors for Parties to consider:

(a) Is there a desire to facilitate communication and transparency to a wide audience? In which case a shorter number of headline indicators would be desirable;

(b) Is there a desire to have a comprehensive performance management system that enable the tracking of progress for all and on all actions, as well as the effectiveness of those actions? In that case, covering as many goals, milestones and targets as possible and practical would be desirable.

194. One option to meet both those objectives would be to maintain a list of indicators in the range of the current list and to identify a short list that would be primarily targeted for communication value and purpose.

195. Another option would be to decrease the number of indicators. There are several different approaches to do this including:

(a) Only include currently operational indicators in the list of headline indicators (i.e. not include those that need development);

- However, then some key issues (such as ABS) might not be included in the list of headline indicators.

(b) Focus the list of headline indicators on targets, which require a global approach to action (for example, indicators related to national participation in decision-making are an issue that requires national approaches and could be monitored using national indicators only);

- However, other Parties have expressed an interest in being able to have standardized information, which could be aggregated to the global level across all targets.

(c) Group the goals and targets, and attempt to identify a small set of indicators that captures progress across a group of targets and possibly goals:

- (i) Prioritization of indicators related to goals (over targets) would be required, and consequently, as some information on progress on targets would not be available, it may not be possible to understand progress on actions;
- (ii) A nested approach, where individual goals are associated exclusively with a set of action targets and which has been proposed by some Parties, could facilitate this.
- (iii) There are already some elements of this concept in the current Monitoring Framework: The Essential Biodiversity Variables and the System of Environmental Economic Accounts are proposed to be the basis for a number of indicators; thus, if the underlying statistics were available, then the same dataset could be utilized to produce a few of the current headline indicators. However, if this option were pursued, then it would be more difficult to relay progress on each specific target.

196. Many Parties expressed concern that they might not have enough time to discuss and finalize the indicators. There was a range of views expressed in terms of what could be accomplished by the fifteenth meeting of the Conference of the Parties versus what could or should be completed by the sixteenth meeting of the Conference of the Parties.

197. There is also a range of views on how decisions related to these issues should be reflected in documents for the Conference of the Parties, with some favouring the inclusion of key elements in the framework and others preferring to see details in the separate draft decisions emanating from the subsidiary bodies.

198. It would be useful to resolve those issues at the January meetings.

## **IX. REFLECTIONS ON THE DRAFT DECISION FOR THE CONFERENCE OF THE PARTIES**

### *What we heard*

199. The appendix of the first draft of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework contained draft elements of a possible decision operationalizing framework. These elements were not extensively discussed during the first session of the third meeting of the Working Group and some Parties suggested that it was premature to do so given that the discussions on the framework were ongoing and that the content of a draft decision operationalizing the framework should be informed by the discussions at the twenty-fourth meeting of the Subsidiary Body on Scientific, Technical and Technological Advice and under the Subsidiary Body on Implementation. However, some Parties did suggest specific issues that should be reflected in a draft decision. These issues include resource and capacity needs for the implementation of the framework, Article 20, common but differentiated responsibility, possible funding mechanisms indigenous peoples and local communities, national priorities and flexibility, transparency, national commitments, indicators and the monitoring framework, communication and the balanced implementation of the three objectives of the Convention. In addition to these general points a number of Parties suggested specific textual changes to the draft of the elements of a possible decision.

*Reflections by the Co-Chairs*

200. The post-2020 global biodiversity framework needs to be adopted through a decision of the Conference of the Parties. This decision should also set out the means through which the framework will be operationalized specifically by the Parties to the Convention. In contrast the framework itself, if the intent is for it to be relevant to all of society, should be more general and therefore relevant to a wider audience.

201. In addition to the decision adopting the post-2020 global biodiversity framework several of the decisions anticipated to be adopted at the fifteenth meeting of the Conference of the Parties would be relevant to the operationalization of the framework.<sup>12</sup> When developing the decision adopting and operationalizing the post-2020 global biodiversity framework it will be important to avoid duplication and possible inconsistencies across decisions of the Conference of the Parties.

202. Given the discussions during the first session of the third meeting of the Working Group as well as the reflections set out above, the draft elements of a possible decision operationalizing framework have been updated and been annexed to this note. However, given the preliminary nature of the discussion during the first session and that the content of the decision should be informed, in part, by the outcomes of the twenty-fourth meeting of the Subsidiary Body on Scientific, Technical and Technological Advice and the third meeting of the Subsidiary Body on Implementation, further updates and modification to these elements will most likely be needed.

---

---

<sup>12</sup> These decisions could include, but are not limited to, possible decisions on the enhanced multidimensional approach to planning, monitoring, reporting and review; the updated plan of action on subnational governments, cities and other local authorities for biodiversity; the strategy for resource mobilization; the long-term strategic framework for capacity-building and development to support nationally determined priorities for the implementation of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework; the gender plan of action for the post-2020 period; the communications strategy for the post-2020 global biodiversity framework; the long term approach for mainstreaming and its plan of action; and cooperation with other conventions and international organizations.