REPORT OF THE EXPERT WORKSHOP TO DEVELOP RECOMMENDATIONS FOR POSSIBLE GENDER ELEMENTS IN THE POST-2020 GLOBAL BIODIVERSITY FRAMEWORK, NEW YORK, UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, 11-12 APRIL 2019

Note by the Executive Secretary

INTRODUCTION

1. At its fourteenth meeting, the Conference of the Parties to the Convention on Biological Diversity adopted, among others, decision 14/34 on a comprehensive and participatory process for the preparation of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework, in which it decided that the process to develop the post-2020 global biodiversity framework would be gender-responsive, by systematically integrating a gender perspective and ensuring appropriate representation, particularly of women and girls, in the process. The Conference of the Parties also urged Parties and encouraged other Governments and all relevant organizations and stakeholders to provide contributions and support for developing the post-2020 global biodiversity framework, including by offering to host global, regional, sectoral or thematic consultations.

2. Pursuant to this decision, and with generous financial support from the Government of Canada, the Secretariat of the Convention on Biological Diversity, in collaboration with the United Nations Entity for Gender Equality and the Empowerment of Women (UN-Women), co-organized the Expert Workshop to Develop Recommendations for Possible Gender Elements in the Post-2020 Global Biodiversity Framework, which was held at the headquarters of UN-Women in New York, United States of America, on 11 and 12 April 2019.

3. The workshop was intended to help advance thinking and planning for the integration of gender issues in the post-2020 biodiversity framework, and in so doing support preparation by Parties and other stakeholders of related inputs to the post-2020 process. The workshop proposed to identify various entry points for the integration of a gender perspective in the post-2020 global biodiversity framework, including through a review of selected Aichi Biodiversity Targets and related thematic areas of the Convention.

4. A total of 38 participants representing Parties and experts from international organizations, think tanks and grass-roots and indigenous peoples’ organizations with expertise in gender and biodiversity-related issues took part in the discussions.

5. The present report provides an overview of the approach for the expert workshop in section I, information on the contextual and thematic discussions in section II, and a summary of the main outcomes of the discussions in section III.

I. OVERVIEW OF APPROACH

6. The purpose of the expert workshop was to consider how gender issues might be integrated effectively in the post-2020 global biodiversity framework. Given the early stage of consultations on the development of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework as the expert workshop was being planned, and with the understanding that the current Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020 and its Aichi Biodiversity Targets would inform the development of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework, the workshop format was based upon consideration of thematic areas reflected in the Aichi Targets with
particular relevance for gender and women’s issues. Due to the time constraints of the two-day meeting, the thematic areas were limited to agrobiodiversity, fisheries, forestry, ecosystem restoration, conservation approaches, genetic diversity, and indigenous, local community and rural women.

II. CONTEXT AND THEMATIC DISCUSSIONS

7. The workshop began with two introductory presentations, one on the context of gender mainstreaming under the Convention and the basis for a gender-responsive post-2020 global biodiversity framework delivered by Ms. Tanya McGregor, Gender Programme Officer at the Secretariat of the Convention on Biological Diversity, and one on the Sustainable Development Goal framework and targets and indicators relevant for gender and biodiversity delivered by Ms. Katherine Despot-Belmonte from the United Nations Environment Programme’s World Conservation Monitoring Centre (UNEP-WCMC).

8. Ms. McGregor provided an overview of relevant gender elements of the Convention, including with respect to the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020, the Aichi Biodiversity Targets and the 2015-2020 Gender Plan of Action. She reviewed the mandate for addressing gender in the post-2020 global biodiversity framework, highlighting key decisions of the Conference of the Parties, and outlined some relevant considerations to guide thinking in the workshop discussions, including with respect to interpreting the 2050 Vision of living in harmony with nature from a gender perspective.

9. Ms. Despot-Belmonte highlighted that 80 Sustainable Development Goal indicators were gender-responsive, with many relevant for potential inclusion in a gender-responsive post-2020 global biodiversity framework. She proposed that gender-responsive indicators could be embedded throughout targets of the post-2020 biodiversity framework, including indicators that had been developed under the Sustainable Development Goal framework. These indicators had been developed by custodian agencies (for example, UN-Women, United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP), United Nations Development Programme (UNDP), and Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO)) and were being piloted in countries in collaboration with national statistics offices and relevant line ministries. She gave some examples of gender-responsive indicators from the Sustainable Development Goal framework that could be applied to the post-2020 global biodiversity framework, including:

1.4.2: Proportion of total adult population with secure tenure rights to land, with legally recognized documentation and who perceive their rights to land as secure, by sex and by type of tenure;

5.a.1(a): Proportion of total agricultural population with ownership of secure rights over agricultural land, by sex, and (b) share of women among owners or rights-bearers of agricultural land, by type of tenure;

5.a.2: Proportion of countries where the legal framework (including customary law) guarantees women’s equal rights to land ownership and/or control;

5.c.1: Proportion of countries with systems to track and make public allocation for gender equality and women’s empowerment.

10. Ms. Despot-Belmonte emphasized the opportunity to make use of indicators and data available from gender-relevant Sustainable Development Goal indicators, and the need to make gender visible in targets and indicators in the post-2020 global biodiversity framework. She noted that evidence showed it was easier to monitor specific indicators.

11. A series of short presentations were delivered on the thematic areas selected for the workshop – forestry, ecosystem restoration, conservation approaches, agrobiodiversity, fisheries, genetic diversity, and indigenous, local community and rural women. Presentations outlined the current status and challenges regarding gender perspectives and women’s participation, co-benefits of gender-responsive action, and key actions, strategies, as well as any targets and indicators for reflecting gender perspectives in the thematic area. Participants formed small working groups to identify recommendations or required actions for better integration of a gender perspective in these areas.
A. Forestry

12. Ms. Iliana Monterroso from the Center for International Forestry Research (CIFOR) delivered a presentation on behalf of the Forest, Trees and Agroforestry Programme of the Consortium of International Agricultural Research Centers (CGIAR), analysing the current status and challenges regarding forestry and gender. Drawing on lessons from on-the-ground REDD+ implementation, she discussed the value of gender-responsive forest landscape restoration work. She emphasized the importance of taking a rights-based approach, enabling equitable participation and ensuring equitable distribution mechanisms as key steps toward a gender-transformative approach, or one that works to transform unequal gender power relations.

13. Ms. Monterroso noted that embedding gender into forest landscape restoration activities offers considerable opportunities for leveraging synergies between restoration commitments, climate change action and global commitments to sustainable development. Past restoration initiatives that did not address gender or excluded women exacerbated gender inequalities. Women’s access to land and resources were further restricted, women’s ability to make choices and take decisions were undermined and their work burden heightened. Lessons from past restoration efforts have shown that although women are mobilized to provide labour and skills for restoration initiatives, they usually have less ability to benefit than men. Mechanisms and measures at various scales are required to develop and implement initiatives that equitably benefit members of participating communities.

14. Key recommendations identified were: (a) the recognition of land rights and resources, including knowledge, information and natural resources; (b) capacity-building, including targeting women for economic empowerment initiatives and green entrepreneurship opportunities and training; (c) gender parity quotas, including quotas for socially excluded groups; and (d) gender auditing, with a focus on women’s contribution to the forest sector, and mapping of existing and pending claims around resources.

B. Ecosystem restoration

15. Ms. Cate Owren from the Global Gender Office of the International Union for Conservation of Nature (IUCN) presented an overview of gender and ecosystem restoration challenges and opportunities for strengthening resilience. She noted that restoration provided a powerful opportunity for transformational systems change and championing harmonized action toward interlinked goals at multiple levels. This could also provide an avenue for women’s economic empowerment, and strengthening climate resilience. Ms. Owren highlighted that women and men contributed differently to restoration options and valued benefits differently, which could open new possibilities for restoration. Gender-responsive restoration could function to secure land and resource rights, towards more sustainable livelihoods, strengthened ecosystem management and equitable outcomes.

16. Key recommendations were: (a) ensuring equal land and resource tenure rights; (b) supporting visibility of women’s roles and of participation, representation and leadership; removing barriers to accessing information, training and tools and improving equitable access to financial tools; and (c) strengthening women’s organizing and bargaining power. Related actions included undertaking gender analysis to identify constraints and facilitating participation of women, as well as supporting women’s access to decision-making, in particular to address inequalities in collective access to land and resources.

C. Conservation approaches

17. Ms. Francesca Booker from the International Institute for Environment and Development (IIED) presented the work of IIED and partners to define the concept of equity in a conservation context. She explained that they defined equity as having three dimensions: recognition, procedure and distribution. Recognition referred to acknowledging and respecting rights and the diversity of identities, knowledge systems, values and institutions of different actors. Procedure addressed the participation of actors in

1 This framework is included in the Voluntary Guidance on Effective Governance Models for Management of Protected Areas, including Equity, taking into account work being undertaken under Article 8(j) and Related Provisions, contained in annex II of decision XIV/8 (https://www.cbd.int/doc/decisions/cop-14/cop-14-dec-08-en.pdf).
decision-making, transparency, accountability and dispute resolution. Distribution referred to the allocation of benefits and costs across the set of actors, and how the costs were experienced and mitigated. Examples were shared from social and governance assessments on gender equity in protected areas in Uganda and Kenya. Social assessments were used to distinguish the relative importance of social impacts (positive and negative) for women versus those for men, which was important to direct local action towards more gender-equitable outcomes. Ms. Booker recommended that the post-2020 global biodiversity framework should actively seek to promote actions on all three dimensions of equity.

18. Mr. Delfin Ganapin from WWF International gave a short presentation on community-based conservation as an effective way to protect and restore nature. He highlighted that the potential for community-based conservation was significant, with about 3.8 billion hectares of lands in 87 countries de facto held by indigenous peoples and local communities. He noted that women’s lead roles in seed keeping, herbal medicine, forage and fodder management, fuelwood, and home gardens made them the agro-biodiversity managers of their communities. As such, community mapping for rights advocacy and for land use zoning must involve women for proper delineation and valuation of those resources. He also highlighted the fact that alternative livelihoods that drew people away from destructive logging or fishing as well as mining, such as those that involved the harvesting and sale of non-timber products, crafts, ecotourism, and retail stores, had been shown to be best led by women. Women were keepers of indigenous and traditional knowledge and of biocultural heritage, an important aspect of education given the widening generational gap between elders and youth in many indigenous and local communities.

19. Key recommendations included the need for policy reform, in some cases requiring cultural change, so that women had the right to own and inherit land. More focused gender equality components and dedicated funding for women in community conservation projects were also needed, as the current allocation for that was only about 5 per cent of donor assistance. Further recommendations included facilitating awareness and knowledge sharing on gender-responsive conservation initiatives through the establishment of institutional structures and peer-to-peer exchange and strengthening gender dimensions in the development, implementation, monitoring and reporting on conservation projects. Economic case studies of the value of gender equality were proposed, to support the shift from “fortress” to inclusive conservation.

20. With regard to strengthening equitable governance, recommendations included undertaking qualitative and quantitative gender assessments of protected areas, other effective area-based conservation measures, and indigenous and community conserved areas. Gender assessments should include a review of governance models, management tools and gender-balanced participation.

D. Agrobiodiversity

21. Ms. Szilvia Lehel from FAO spoke about the nexus between agrobiodiversity and gender equality, drawing on some key findings of the recent comprehensive report entitled The State of the World’s Biodiversity for Food and Agriculture, published by FAO. She noted that agrobiodiversity was indispensable to food security and nutrition, sustainable development and the supply of many vital ecosystem services, in the face of challenges posed by climate change and other threats. The FAO report highlighted the fact that the gender gap in agriculture and the uneven power relations in the access to and control over land and other natural resources and assets directly influenced the capacities and incentives of men and women to conserve agrobiodiversity. Similarly, unsustainable management practices and changes in land and water use threatened livelihoods, with impacts on common-property resources for fuelwood, fodder and wild foods, resources upon which women were often disproportionately dependent. The report also illustrated that women, including indigenous women, were holders and keepers of critical conservation knowledge and practices and were directly linked to the management of genetic resources, emphasizing that women were an essential part of the solutions for halting the dramatic pace of biodiversity loss.

22. Recommendations included the need for a coordinated effort to develop the post-2020 global biodiversity framework, focusing on better responding to the gender-differentiated needs, priorities and capabilities in the management of agrobiodiversity. Action was also needed to remove persistent structural barriers stemming from gender inequality, including through alignment with efforts to achieve the Sustainable Development Goals, to increase the application of gender-responsive management practices and create an enabling environment for effective and inclusive in situ and ex situ conservation and sustainable use of agrobiodiversity at all levels.

E. Fisheries

23. Ms. Afrina Choudhury from WorldFish drew on recent research³ to present the current status and challenges with regard to gender perspectives and women’s participation, with a focus on interlinked dimensions of small-scale fisheries, including sustainability, participatory governance and human well-being. Issues discussed included the need to change our understanding of fisheries, to take into account women’s roles, ensure food security, address inequitable tenure rights and fisheries policies, as well as ensure equal access to fishing, marketing and marketing resources, recognition of and opportunities for fisheries labour, and equal pay. With respect to key actions and strategies, she highlighted the importance of implementing the FAO Voluntary Guidelines for Securing Sustainable Small-Scale Fisheries, which had gender issues integrated throughout. She concluded with a discussion on approaches needed to achieve transformational change in the sector.

24. Key recommendations regarding participation and decision-making were: (a) conducting capacity-building to help make women fishers less invisible to ministries of fisherie and (b) recognizing the value of women in fisheries, including women’s catch. Proposals included mapping women’s roles in value chains, and collecting evidence on conservation outcomes from gender-responsive approaches, to consider what works, what does not work, and what happens when gender is not integrated in conservation outcomes. Support was proposed for women’s enterprise building in small-scale fisheries, towards equitable benefit sharing.

F. Genetic diversity

25. Ms. Olga Hernandez from the Humboldt Institute spoke about the important role of rural women as native seed domesticators and protectors, giving the example of processes carried out in the chagras or productive gardens across Colombia. These areas were the basis of production and food systems for communities, as well as providing income and food security. She highlighted that equity was needed in regulatory frameworks for the management of native seeds. She noted the importance of including a gender perspective at the start of project development, for projects dealing with agriculture, the economics of ecosystems and biodiversity, and biodiversity in general. In addition, gender indicators were needed to measure impacts and results in those projects, and women’s unpaid contributions in care work also needed to be factored into pricing of products derived from biodiversity and agrobiodiversity.

26. Recommendations included adding value to traditional products and linking local producers to international markets. This approach included capacity-building for women to be producers and entrepreneurs in the fair trade market. Other recommendations included undertaking a cost-benefit analysis to look at the place and role of women in value chains related to biodiversity.

G. Indigenous, local community and rural women

27. Ms. Thingreiphi Lungharwo from the Naga Women’s Union in India shared perspectives on the vital role of indigenous women in stewardship, caring and nurturing biodiversity. She emphasized that the lack of legal recognition of indigenous identities in some countries or non-implementation of laws posed major challenges for indigenous women and local communities. She noted that, in general, women had no control over land, territories and resources, and indigenous women’s traditional knowledge was

³ The presentation was drawn largely from Danika et al, 2017. “Promoting gender equity and equality through the small-scale fisheries guidelines: experiences from multiple case studies”.
https://www.researchgate.net/publication/317644549_Promoting_Gender_Equity_and_Equality_Through_the_Small-Scale_Fisheries_Guidelines_Experiences_from_Multiple_Case_Studies
vanishing, while there was limited documentation of their contributions. They faced barriers to access to information, credit facilities, government support schemes and programmes due to language barriers and the remoteness of the areas where they lived. Yet, she also highlighted that small grants programmes available for indigenous women had been beneficial for strengthening networks and advocacy from the community level to the national, regional and international levels. She noted that this served as a good platform for building indigenous women’s leadership through peer learning and for sharing information and awareness creation.

III. VIEWS REGARDING THE INTEGRATION OF A GENDER PERSPECTIVE IN THE POST-2020 GLOBAL BIODIVERSITY FRAMEWORK

28. The following is a synthesis of the general views and perspectives expressed by participants during the consultation regarding the post-2020 global biodiversity framework.

A. Opportunities and challenges

29. Participants recognized the importance of linking to the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development and the relevant Sustainable Development Goals, and linking to other relevant international policies, including the Convention on the Elimination of Discrimination Against Women. Participants also emphasized the need to take into account the diversity of women and cultures, and address violence against women and, in particular, against environmental defenders.

30. Participants further emphasized the important role of women as agents of change, and the value of women’s empowerment for achieving strong biodiversity outcomes. It was observed that Member States increasingly recognized that women were custodians of knowledge and responsible for conservation action, but capacities to address needs for women’s engagement remained limited.

31. Participants remarked that good practice examples were available from many countries, illustrating gender dimensions of biodiversity practices which could be scaled up. Best practice in the policy context included the FAO Voluntary Guidelines for Securing Sustainable Small-Scale Fisheries, which were suffused with gender equality.

32. Participants further noted the need to clarify gender biodiversity linkages and share key messages with a range of partners and stakeholders.

Challenges

33. Participants agreed that conservation initiatives could negatively affect women disproportionately. Primary barriers to improving the situation of women in the conservation, sustainable use and sharing of benefits from biodiversity included the following:

(a) Lack of equal participation and representation of women in biodiversity-related processes and programmes;

(b) Lack of access to resources, and inequitable, or the absence of, mechanisms to ensure equitable benefit-sharing;

(c) Gaps in data and evidence on women’s contributions, leading women’s roles and contributions to be invisible;

(d) Uneven power relations and discriminatory customary laws that continue to impede women’s rights, access to and control over land, and which influence their roles, responsibilities, capacities and incentives to conserve biodiversity;

(e) Lack of access to information and information services tailored to the needs of women in communities.

34. Gaps identified that were specific to the process under the Convention on Biological Diversity included the lack of focus on equitable access and rights to natural resources in national biodiversity strategies and action plans (NBSAPs), and lack of reporting on gender issues in national reports.

B. Elements of a gender-responsive post-2020 global biodiversity framework

35. Participants were asked to reflect on proposals for gender-responsive actions for the different thematic areas, to identify a broader series of gender elements for the post-2020 framework. This involved discussion on how the 2050 Vision might be realized, and possible principles for the framework, overarching objectives, key elements and means of implementation.

1. Vision and principles

36. Participants were asked to consider how the 2050 Vision of living in harmony with nature could be achieved through a gender-responsive post-2020 global biodiversity framework. To ensure that ecosystem services and biodiversity could deliver ecosystem benefits for all people as put forward in the Vision, participants emphasized equitable access to resources and benefits as a key requirement. Relationally, gender equality and the empowerment of women and girls was seen as vital for the realization of the Vision, with the understanding that women and girls have an important stewardship role in safeguarding biodiversity.

37. The Vision was also seen as a means to link, harmonize and accelerate progress towards achieving the Sustainable Development Goals, with respect to their relevance for achieving gender objectives. Participants highlighted the importance of planning with future generations in mind, proposing that “benefits of ecosystem services and biodiversity be maintained in an equitable and just manner for the next generations”. Additional proposals for gender-responsive vision statements emphasized the empowerment of women and girls, rural and indigenous communities, and ensuring gender equality as necessary for halting biodiversity loss and degradation. They also highlighted the commitment of communities and countries to their stewardship role and responsibilities for caring for and nurturing nature.

38. With respect to general principles for the post-2020 global biodiversity framework, participants agreed that the framework should be rights-based, gender-responsive, inclusive, participatory and equitable.

2. Overarching objectives

39. Several overarching objectives were put forward by participants for consideration in the post-2020 global biodiversity framework. They are summarized as follows:

(a) Recognizing and enhancing women’s agency, participation and leadership for biodiversity;
(b) Strengthening women’s collective action;
(c) Realizing women’s rights for the equitable access, control and ownership of resources, including land;
(d) Enhancing and ensuring equitable benefits and human well-being.

3. Key elements/actions

40. Building on the overarching objectives, participants identified some related and more specific key elements or actions to realize each of the proposed objectives. Suggested key elements/actions included the following:

(a) Recognizing and enhancing women’s agency, participation and leadership for biodiversity:

(i) Enhancing governance mechanisms that allow for active participation of women as well as men in biodiversity decision-making;
(ii) Ensuring that women make up 30 to 50 per cent of biodiversity-related decision-making bodies and processes, with allocated leadership positions in these bodies and processes;

(b) Strengthening women’s collective action:

(i) Supporting the participation of women’s collectives in formal market-based activities;

(ii) Providing targeted financing for women’s collective actions and supporting the inclusion of women’s collectives in decision-making;

(c) Realizing women’s rights for the equitable access, control and ownership of resources, including land:

(i) Enacting/reforming legislation for secure tenure rights and the equitable access to and control of agricultural land, forests and marine areas;

(ii) Increasing the percentage of women who own official land titles, as well as supporting women’s collectives in securing tenure rights and equitable access to agricultural land;

(iii) Enhancing the protection of the rights of indigenous women for equitable access to genetic resources and associated traditional knowledge;

(d) Enhancing and ensuring equitable benefits and human well-being:

(i) Identifying women’s and men’s roles across biodiversity-based value chains, to highlight needs for equal opportunities, pay and decision-making;

(ii) Addressing welfare-related aspects of conservation (gender-based violence, food security, education, health) in conservation interventions to create a safe and enabling environment for women and men;

(e) Establishing community protocols for access and management of scarce resources, particularly water and other forest resources, to reduce the burden of women and girls.

4. Means of implementation

41. Participants were asked to consider what enabling actions were needed to ensure effective implementation of a gender-responsive post-2020 global biodiversity framework. Enabling actions proposed for discussion included such activities as capacity-building, resource mobilization, research, data and statistics, strategic partnerships, and monitoring and evaluation, at levels from global to local.

42. Proposals included focusing capacity-building efforts on training women, including indigenous, local and rural women, as leaders of conservation efforts, rather than just as beneficiaries. Participants also proposed education for different target audiences, such as educating communicators on gender and biodiversity issues in order to develop more compelling messages, and training environmental policymakers on gender-responsive communication strategies. Related proposals included identifying women’s and men’s roles in biodiversity-based value chains and educating consumers about gender impacts.

43. Another focus of awareness-raising, capacity-building and training was on ensuring that women and men, particularly at local levels, would be informed of their rights and benefits from conservation interventions. Participants proposed that awareness-raising and capacity-building on rights and benefits be mandatory for conservation interventions, with the suggestion that at least 10 per cent of budgets be allocated for awareness-raising and capacity-building components for indigenous, rural and local women. It was proposed that awareness-raising and knowledge-sharing on gender-responsive conservation initiatives be facilitated through the establishment of institutional structures and peer-to-peer learning, as well as South-South exchange. It was further suggested that national laws be communicated in order to ensure that women and men know their rights.

44. In addition to awareness-raising and capacity-building, participants also highlighted the importance of consulting women, and particularly indigenous women, prior to the establishment of new conservation policies and protected areas. Women’s traditional knowledge and roles, such as in
small-scale fisheries, were emphasized as valuable sources of information to inform conservation planning. The need for free, prior and informed consent processes to be gender-responsive was further raised as an important action.

45. Participants further proposed the need to collect data disaggregated by sex, age and other socioeconomic indicators on direct and indirect beneficiaries of conservation interventions.

46. With respect to the need for dedicated finance, there was a difference of views among participants on the feasibility of including an action in the post-2020 global biodiversity framework to make conservation funding conditional upon achieving minimum gender quotas in project or programme management committees. Participants proposed that financial and other forms of support programmes include awareness-raising and capacity-building components on how to access the programmes. The need for payment for ecosystem services schemes to target women beneficiaries was also highlighted.

47. Proposals focused on the operation of the Convention included ensuring that national reporting would include sex-disaggregated data, gender analysis and gender indicators. The importance of addressing the roles and contributions of indigenous and local community women within national biodiversity strategies and action plans and other relevant national policy frameworks was also mentioned. Participants noted the need for enhanced synergies with activities of other conventions on gender equality, and proposed that a national gender focal point be established for each Party to the Convention on Biological Diversity. More broadly, participants put forward the importance of increased coordination between ministries or other authorities responsible for gender affairs, environment, public health and other development issues, and the need to “translate” global policy frameworks to the local level.

C. Next steps

48. Prior to closing of the workshop, participants discussed next steps to support the consideration of gender equality in the process to develop the post-2020 global biodiversity framework. Opportunities to engage through the Convention’s Friends of Gender Equality Group and the For All Coalition for Gender Equality and Human Rights were highlighted, and participants proposed a webinar to follow up on discussions from the workshop. Other opportunities identified included the IUCN World Conservation Congress in June 2020, and the new deal for nature and people being promoted by a number of organizations, including the World Wildlife Fund (WWF). One Party also suggested the possibility of hosting a follow-on meeting of the group to support further consideration of gender as the post-2020 framework became more developed.