



Convention on Biological Diversity

Distr.
GENERAL

CBD/SBSTTA-SBI-SS/1/2
18 September 2020

ORIGINAL: ENGLISH

SUBSIDIARY BODY ON SCIENTIFIC,
TECHNICAL AND TECHNOLOGICAL ADVICE
SUBSIDIARY BODY ON IMPLEMENTATION
Special virtual sessions
Online, 15-18 September 2020

REPORT ON THE SPECIAL VIRTUAL SESSIONS OF THE SUBSIDIARY BODY ON SCIENTIFIC, TECHNICAL AND TECHNOLOGICAL ADVICE AND THE SUBSIDIARY BODY ON IMPLEMENTATION, 15-18 SEPTEMBER 2020

Contents

INTRODUCTION	2
I. REPORT ON THE SPECIAL SESSION OF THE SUBSIDIARY BODY ON SCIENTIFIC, TECHNICAL AND TECHNOLOGICAL ADVICE	3
Item 1. Opening of the special session	3
Item 2. Presentation of the fifth edition of the Global Biodiversity Outlook.....	5
Item 3. Closure of the special session	13
II. REPORT ON THE SPECIAL SESSION OF THE SUBSIDIARY BODY ON IMPLEMENTATION	14
Item 1. Opening of the special session	14
Item 2. Presentation of review reports	15
Item 3. Presentation by the panel on resource mobilization.....	23
Item 4. Closure of the special session	29
III. REPORT ON THE JOINT SPECIAL SESSION OF THE SUBSIDIARY BODY ON SCIENTIFIC, TECHNICAL AND TECHNOLOGICAL ADVICE AND THE SUBSIDIARY BODY ON IMPLEMENTATION.....	30
Item 1. Opening of the special session.....	30
Item 2. Presentation of the updated draft of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework.....	31
Item 3. Closure of the special session	42

INTRODUCTION

The twenty-fourth meeting of the Subsidiary Body on Scientific, Technical and Technological Advice and the third meeting of the Subsidiary Body on Implementation were due to be held in November 2020, having been rescheduled from May 2020 and then August 2020 due the COVID-19 pandemic.

In the context of the pandemic, with a view to maintaining momentum ahead of the United Nations Biodiversity Summit and towards the fifteenth meeting of the Conference of the Parties and to facilitating preparations for the meetings of the subsidiary bodies, a series of special virtual sessions of the Subsidiary Body on Scientific, Technical and Technological Advice and the Subsidiary Body on Implementation were held from 15 to 18 September 2020, as follows:

(a) A special session of the Subsidiary Body on Scientific, Technical and Technological Advice (15 September 2020), during which the launch of the fifth edition of the *Global Biodiversity Outlook* took place;

(b) A special session of the Subsidiary Body on Implementation (16 and 17 September 2020), which included testing of a party-led review process, through an open-ended forum, and reports by a panel of experts on several issues related to the development of the resource mobilization component to help inform the work of the Working Group on the Post-2020 Global Biodiversity Framework and the Conference of the Parties;

(c) A joint special session of the Subsidiary Body on Scientific, Technical and Technological Advice and Subsidiary Body on Implementation (18 September 2020), during which an update on the process for developing the post-2020 global biodiversity framework and a presentation of the updated zero draft were provided.

The present document contains reports of these sessions, prepared by the Executive Secretary.

I. REPORT ON THE SPECIAL SESSION OF THE SUBSIDIARY BODY ON SCIENTIFIC, TECHNICAL AND TECHNOLOGICAL ADVICE

ITEM 1. OPENING OF THE SPECIAL SESSION

1. The special session of the Subsidiary Body on Scientific, Technical and Technological Advice was opened at 7 a.m. on Tuesday, 15 September 2020, by Mr. Hesiquio Benítez Díaz (Mexico), Chair of the Subsidiary Body, who welcomed the participants and thanked the Bureau of the Conference of the Parties (Bureau) for organizing the sessions, and the Executive Secretary and her staff for the preparations made to hold them. Due to the COVID-19 pandemic, there had been repeated delays in scheduling the twenty-fourth meeting of the Subsidiary Body on Scientific, Technical and Technological Advice and the third meeting of the Subsidiary Body on Implementation. Those physical meetings would now be held in the first quarter of 2021, conditions permitting. The present series of special virtual sessions, as well as other virtual sessions that the Bureau was considering, sought to facilitate preparations for those meetings. The present virtual sessions would also help maintain momentum ahead of both the United Nations Biodiversity Summit, which would be held at the end of the present month, and the fifteenth meeting of the Conference of the Parties to the Convention on Biological Diversity which would be held in Kunming, China in 2021.
2. Pursuant to decision [14/35](#) of the Conference of the Parties, the Executive Secretary had prepared the fifth edition of the *Global Biodiversity Outlook*, which included a summary for policymakers. The indicative timetable had envisaged that the fifth edition of the *Global Biodiversity Outlook* would be launched at the opening of the twenty-fourth meeting of the Subsidiary Body on Scientific, Technical and Technological Advice. That meeting, however, had been postponed, and in order to keep momentum while working on the development of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework, it had been decided to launch that important report virtually to enable Parties and observers to make use of it in their preparations for both the twenty-fourth meeting of the Subsidiary Body on Scientific, Technical and Technological Advice and the third meeting of the Subsidiary Body on Implementation, as well as for other work related to the development of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework. That also ensured that the fifth edition of the *Global Biodiversity Outlook* would be launched ahead of the United Nations Biodiversity Summit, to be convened virtually by the President of the General Assembly on 30 September 2020.
3. Opening statements were made by Ms. Elizabeth Maruma Mrema, Executive Secretary of the Convention on Biological Diversity, and Mr. Hamdallah Zedan on behalf of Ms. Yasmine Fouad, Minister of Environment of Egypt and President of the Conference of the Parties. Due to technical difficulties of communication during the virtual session, the initial part of Mr. Zedan's statement was read out by the Deputy Executive Secretary of the Convention.
4. The Executive Secretary welcomed the participants to the special virtual session, the first of a series of special virtual sessions of the Subsidiary Body on Scientific, Technical and Technological Advice and of the Subsidiary Body on Implementation. She said that by their virtual presence they demonstrated their clear determination to maintain the momentum and effort to conserve and protect nature. She also thanked Mr. Zedan for his untiring efforts in support of the Convention, especially by steering the Bureau and guiding the Secretariat through difficult times. She expressed her appreciation to the Chair of the Subsidiary Body on Scientific, Technical and Technological Advice and to its Bureau, for their guidance and support in organizing the session. She said that the participants were living through one of the most extraordinary threats to global health experienced in the past century, with impacts felt across all nations, and she expressed her sympathy and solidarity with those who had lost loved ones or had suffered hardship as a result of the COVID-19 pandemic.
5. The present virtual sessions sought to facilitate preparations for the twenty-fourth meeting of the Subsidiary Body on Scientific, Technical and Technological Advice and the third meeting of the Subsidiary Body on Implementation, which were currently scheduled to begin their work virtually later this year and to complete it, hopefully, at physical meetings, in the first quarter of 2021. The sessions would also help raise the political profile of the global biodiversity agenda ahead of the United Nations Biodiversity Summit, and continue on the path towards the fifteenth meeting of the Conference of the Parties, where a post-2020 global biodiversity framework would be adopted setting out a transformative and innovative plan

to implement broad-based action towards the 2050 Vision of “Living in harmony with nature”. To understand what actions were needed, a clear and authoritative assessment was required of where we were, where we needed to go, and what we needed to do to get there. The fifth edition of the *Global Biodiversity Outlook* provided precisely that information, and she expressed her sincere appreciation to all Parties and individuals that had contributed to it, either by submitting their sixth national reports or providing peer review comments or sharing their expertise and knowledge. The fifth edition of the *Global Biodiversity Outlook* was the output of the community that had rallied around the Convention, and she thanked the Governments of Canada, the European Union, Japan, and the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland for the financial contributions that had made its preparation possible.

6. The stark conclusion of the fifth edition of the *Global Biodiversity Outlook* was that none of the twenty Aichi Biodiversity Targets had been achieved in full, although six of them had been partially met through one or more of the targets’ sub-elements. The result was disappointing, and indicated that Parties, individually and collectively, had not taken the actions necessary to reverse biodiversity loss. However, while biodiversity continued to be lost, progress had been made in a number of countries. More importantly, the report showed that where policy measures had been put in place, and where actions had been taken and implemented, they had delivered results.

7. In closing, she said that in the days ahead the participants would discuss progress towards a new global pact to protect biodiversity and identify the pathways to make progress by 2030 towards the world’s ultimate vision of “Living in harmony with nature” by 2050. The fifth edition of the *Global Biodiversity Outlook* provided vital information in that regard, identifying the types of actions needed to stem the loss of biodiversity, bend the curve, and put biodiversity on a path of recovery. It identified eight vital areas of transition where actions would need to be implemented to achieve that. The future of humanity depended on the determination to act now, and the present session could not have come at a more important time. She looked forward to hearing the participants’ valuable insights and perspectives on that historic report.

8. The participants were welcomed to the virtual session for the launch of the fifth edition of the *Global Biodiversity Outlook* by Mr. Hamdallah Zedan on behalf of Ms. Yasmine Fouad, Minister of Environment of Egypt and President of the Conference of the Parties. Mr. Zedan expressed his solidarity with the participants during the COVID-19 pandemic. The present special virtual sessions had been convened to facilitate preparations for the full meetings 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, and to provide some context ahead of the upcoming United Nations Summit on Biodiversity. As this was the first time Parties were meeting since her appointment as Executive Secretary of the Convention, the participants were asked to join in congratulating Ms. Elizabeth Maruma Mrema on her new position.

9. Mr. Zedan said that the fifth edition of the *Global Biodiversity Outlook* came at a critical time. Not only were preparations being made for the post-2020 global biodiversity framework, but countries around the world were also developing their plans to recover from the impacts of the COVID-19 pandemic; the report contained information that would help countries as they sought to make a better recovery. As countries implemented their recovery efforts to rebuild their economies and strengthen their health systems, it was essential for the issues of climate, land, biodiversity, and water to be placed at the heart of those efforts.

10. For decades, the world had been fighting to ensure the health and prosperity of all people and eradicate poverty; to ensure good food and nutrition, clean water, education, employment and to build strong and inclusive economies. It had been fighting to ensure that the natural world, on which these depended, that its climate, biodiversity, land, water and oceans were sustained for future generations. The COVID-19 pandemic had challenged all that with its immense impact on health, society and economies. Consequently, the present discussions, ahead of the United Nations Biodiversity Summit, were very timely. That Summit would provide a unique opportunity to demonstrate ambition and to accelerate action on biodiversity for sustainable development, thereby giving momentum to the development and eventual adoption of an effective post-2020 global biodiversity framework at the fifteenth meeting of the Conference of the Parties.

ITEM 2. PRESENTATION OF THE FIFTH EDITION OF THE GLOBAL BIODIVERSITY OUTLOOK

11. At the invitation of the Chair, the Subsidiary Body on Scientific, Technical and Technological Advice heard presentations from Mr. David Cooper, Deputy Executive Secretary of the Convention, on the fifth edition of the *Global Biodiversity Outlook*; Ms. Joji Carino, the Forest Peoples Programme, on the second edition of the *Local Biodiversity Outlooks*; and Ms. Suzanne Sharrock, Botanical Gardens Conservation International (BGCI), on the Global Strategy for Plant Conservation.

Presentation by the Deputy Executive Secretary

12. The Deputy Executive Secretary said that the mandate for the fifth edition of the *Global Biodiversity Outlook*¹ (decisions [XIII/29](#) and 14/35) was to provide a report on progress toward achieving the Aichi Biodiversity Targets, and the contributions to the Sustainable Development Goals, as a basis for the post-2020 global biodiversity framework. In doing so, a variety of sources had been used, drawing upon, inter alia, the sixth national reports and the recent and landmark Global Assessment of Biodiversity and Ecosystem Services of the Intergovernmental Science-Policy Platform on Biodiversity and Ecosystem Services (IPBES).²

13. The first part of the fifth edition of the *Global Biodiversity Outlook*, on biodiversity for sustainable development, examined the interaction between biodiversity and the Sustainable Development Goals. It was already clear from the IPBES Global Assessment that the decline in biodiversity jeopardized those goals, and that loss of biodiversity removed one of the essential contributions being made towards them. The *Outlook* had also looked at how the Sustainable Development Goals supported biodiversity and at those cases where care would be needed to ensure that the Sustainable Development Goals and biodiversity supported each other.

14. The second part of the fifth edition of the *Global Biodiversity Outlook* provided an assessment of progress towards each of the Aichi Biodiversity Targets. That analysis had shown that while progress had been being made it was not generally sufficient to meet those national targets, many of which were also poorly aligned with the Aichi Biodiversity Targets. However, it could also be seen that there had been much progress towards achieving elements of several targets. The ratification of the Nagoya Protocol on Access and Benefit-sharing had been achieved ahead of schedule; progress had been made in prioritizing alien species for action and preventing their introduction; marine and terrestrial protected areas had been greatly expanded; national biodiversity strategies and action plans (NBSAPs) had been updated; international financial support for biodiversity had doubled; and there had been progress on the data and information available to the public and citizen science. On the other hand, there were clear areas where progress had not been made, and in particular there had been poor progress addressing harmful incentives and it was estimated that US\$ 500 billion was still being spent annually on such subsidies.

15. The overall results often hid areas of real progress. Some 100 countries had incorporated biodiversity values into their national accounting systems and had aligned them with international norms; the rate of deforestation was a third lower than it had been in the previous decade, particularly in South America; and while a third of fish stocks were still being overfished, for those fisheries with good management policies and stock assessments, approximately half of all fisheries, there had been a recovery in biomass. Although as shown by the IPBES Global Assessment almost a million species were threatened with extinction, conservation actions had prevented the extinction of between 28 and 48 bird and mammal species since the Convention came into force, and between 11 and 25 species since 2010. There were a number of lessons to be drawn from the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020, one of which was that

¹ <https://www.cbd.int/gbo5>.

² See IPBES (2019): *Global assessment report on biodiversity and ecosystem services of the Intergovernmental Science-Policy Platform on Biodiversity and Ecosystem Services*. E. S. Brondizio et al. (editors). IPBES secretariat, Bonn, Germany; and IPBES (2019): *Summary for policymakers of the global assessment report on biodiversity and ecosystem services of the Intergovernmental Science-Policy Platform on Biodiversity and Ecosystem Services*. S. Diaz et al. (editors). IPBES secretariat, Bonn, Germany. 56 pages. <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.3553579>.

greater effort was required to address the direct and indirect drivers of biodiversity loss, but he stressed that if policies were implemented and enforced, then they achieved results.

16. Part three of the fifth edition of the *Global Biodiversity Outlook* addressed the pathways to achieving the 2050 Vision of “Living in harmony with nature”. A recent publication in the journal *Nature* had shown that bending the curve of biodiversity loss on land required not only investment in conservation and restoration but changes in agricultural production, trade and consumption patterns. Putting nature on a path to recovery, at land and at sea, towards the 2050 Vision required transformative change through a portfolio of actions. While land-use change and overfishing were presently the largest drivers of biodiversity loss, climate change was projected to become the largest driver if the increase in climate temperatures was not kept well below a 2°C increase and close to 1.5°C. The fifth edition of the *Global Biodiversity Outlook* contained eight areas of transition, or transitions, and he illustrated the interactions among them. A sustainable climate action transition employed nature-based solutions, alongside a rapid phase-out of fossil fuel use, reducing the scale and impacts of climate change, while providing positive benefits for biodiversity and other Sustainable Development Goals. That transition recognized the role of biodiversity in sustaining the capacity of the biosphere to mitigate climate change through carbon storage and sequestration while enabling adaptation through resilient ecosystems, as well promoting renewable energy that avoided negative impacts on biodiversity.

17. He also gave the example of a biodiversity-inclusive One Health transition. The recent COVID-19 pandemic had highlighted the health risks of wildlife trade. Managing ecosystems, including agricultural and urban ecosystems, required an integrated approach to promote healthy ecosystems and healthy people. A concerted interdisciplinary approach was needed, as many of the common drivers of biodiversity loss, disease risk and ill-health were interlinked.

18. Achieving change in each of the eight transitions would amount to the transformative change that had been identified in the IPBES Global Assessment. That report had identified some key leverage points where policies could make a difference and explained how those related to each of those eight transitions. In conclusion, he said that while the Aichi Biodiversity Targets had not generally been met there were many examples of success. Policies measures did work, and looking forward, it was possible to put nature on a path of recovery towards the 2050 Vision of “Living in harmony with nature”. That required strong conservation and restoration actions, and also required that all the drivers of biodiversity loss were addressed. Reversing the degradation of biodiversity would also help achieve the global health agenda, the climate agenda and the Sustainable Development Goals.

Presentation by Ms. Carino

19. Ms. Carino introduced the second edition of the *Local Biodiversity Outlooks*³ which had been developed in concert with the fifth edition of the *Global Biodiversity Outlook*. She thanked the collaborators who had made that work possible: the International Indigenous Forum on Biodiversity (IIFB), the Indigenous Women’s Biodiversity Network (IWBN), the Centres of Distinction on Indigenous and Local Knowledge (COD-ILK), the Forest Peoples Programme (FPP) and the Secretariat of the Convention on Biological Diversity (Secretariat).

20. She also thanked the following donors: the Secretariat, the Government of Japan through the Japan Biodiversity Fund; the Department for Environment, Food & Rural Affairs of the Government of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland; the Ministry of the Environment of the Government of Finland; the Swedish International Development Cooperation Agency (SIDA) through SwedBio at the Stockholm Resilience Centre; the Government of France through the Embassy of France to the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland; the Torres Strait Regional Authority (Australia); Nia Tero; the Christensen Fund; the Ford Foundation; and the Assembly of First Nations (Canada).

21. The fifth edition of the *Global Biodiversity Outlook* had presented the latest analysis of the global status and trends of biodiversity, and had laid bare the features of the political, economic, technological, health and cultural systems that had extracted far too much of nature’s bounty. It had shown that the Earth’s

³ <https://www.cbd.int/gbo5/local-biodiversity-outlooks-2>.

biosphere was damaged and weak. However, that was only one facet of the biodiversity story. The report focused on local biodiversity and on stories of resilience, from speakers giving voice to the pains of Mother Nature as her children and healers: indigenous peoples and local communities who were actively working with biological diversity, through genes, species and ecosystems as food, as relations, and as homelands. Those voices were often quiet and unheard, and when loudly voiced, had been violently suppressed or silenced, as evidenced by the increasing number of indigenous human rights and environmental defenders being killed. She said this publication was dedicated to them.

22. The second edition of the *Local Biodiversity Outlooks* highlighted over 50 stories by authors from indigenous peoples and local communities from around the world, presenting their perspectives and experiences of the current social-ecological crisis, as well as their contributions to the United Nations Decade on Biodiversity, and the local solutions to biodiversity management, climate change and sustainable development. The report had identified six critical transitions required for achieving the 2050 Vision of “Living in harmony with nature”, which were closely aligned with the eight transitions of the fifth edition of the *Global Biodiversity Outlook*. Those six transitions were: securing the land rights and customary land tenure of indigenous peoples and local communities; revitalizing indigenous and local sustainable food systems; recognizing and respecting diverse ways of knowing and doing; inclusive decision-making and self-determined development; the sustainable use of resources and the flourishing of diverse local economies; and rewarding effective indigenous solutions and stopping finance for destruction.

23. She said that those were intergenerational visions that honoured the historical struggles and wisdom of past generations, drew from the experience and innovations of today’s living generations, and embodied the legacy and hopes for future generations. They contributed to humanity’s joint endeavour to save its common home.

24. The findings and lessons contained in the second edition of the *Local Biodiversity Outlooks* were similar to those of the fifth edition of the *Global Biodiversity Outlook*. Aichi Biodiversity Target 18, relating to traditional knowledge and customary sustainable use, had not been achieved, with only ten per cent of Parties including indigenous peoples and local communities in their NBSAPs, and the indicators on traditional knowledge had not been applied. That ongoing disregard of the vital contributions of indigenous peoples and local communities to biodiversity conservation, restoration and sustainable use had been a major missed opportunity and that neglect had affected the underachievement of all 20 Aichi Biodiversity Targets. Sustained partnerships were needed between the sciences and indigenous and local knowledge to solve contemporary problems, and putting the cultures and rights of indigenous peoples and local communities at the heart of the biodiversity strategy would deliver sustainable livelihoods, well-being, and positive outcomes for biodiversity and the climate, as they sustainably managed biodiversity in a reciprocal way with nature. Indigenous ways of knowing, being and doing inspired and evoked new narratives and visions of culture and nature; working together within a living and sacred Earth, and overcoming the separation and imbalances in the relationships between humans and nature was central to addressing the biodiversity and health crises, including the rise of pandemics like COVID-19.

Presentation by Ms. Sharrock

25. Ms. Sharrock reviewed progress towards achieving the objectives and targets of the Global Strategy for Plant Conservation (GSPC),⁴ which had been adopted by the Conference of the Parties with a view to halting the worldwide loss of plant diversity. With five objectives and sixteen targets, the strategy supported all aspects of plant conservation, from information generation and knowledge sharing, through conservation, the sustainable use of wild plants and genetic resources, to capacity-building, education and public awareness. It provided clear, stable and long-term goals which had been adopted at global, national and local levels by a wide range of stakeholders. Some Parties, including a number of mega-diverse Parties, such as China, Mexico and South Africa, had developed specific responses to the global strategy, while other countries were implementing it through their NBSAPs.

⁴ See <https://www.cbd.int/gbo5/plant-conservation-report-2020>.

26. She reviewed progress in achieving those targets at the national and global levels. At the global level, progress was being made on target 1 (placing the world's flora online), which would be achieved by the end of the year. Besides that target, targets 2 (web-listing) and 14 (public engagement) were the targets most likely to be achieved nationally, while targets 7 (in situ conservation) and 12 (sustainable harvesting) were those least likely to be achieved. The targets had also permitted global responses and new initiatives, and the success in achieving target 1 was the result of an international consortium for placing the world flora online, which was committed to continuing its work beyond 2020. Progress toward implementing target 2 had been achieved through work on the Red List of the International Union for Conservation of Nature (IUCN) and the launch of BGCI's threat search database. That database already included over 300,000 plant conservation assessments at national and global levels and was of fundamental importance to help prioritize national actions.

27. The global tree assessment, another initiative of BGCI and IUCN, would achieve the assessment of all 60,000 tree species by the end of the year. Other examples of progress on specific targets included national initiatives to identify and protect important areas of plant diversity and to conserve certain plant species within them, and she highlighted some of the important plant area programmes currently under development. There had been a considerable growth in networks and partnerships at national and global levels and the number of new thematic global consortiums around specific targets.

28. Although most of the targets would not be met by the end of the year, more progress had been made than would have been possible without the GSPC. Most of that progress had been made where there had been SMART targets, supported by a focused and committed community. For that she stressed the importance of available and accessible data at the national level and capacity-building initiatives. There was also a need for greater alignment, linkages and reporting between the GSPC and other frameworks; plant conservation should be encapsulated in a GSPC that was updated and harmonized with the post-2020 global biodiversity framework. New or updated GSPC targets should provide plant specific milestones, indicators or sub-targets for that framework and, going forward, new focal areas for plant conservation should include ecological restoration, species recovery, sustainable use, and benefit-sharing. Plant diversity was of immeasurable value to humanity, supporting all aspects of life on Earth, and concerted actions through the GSPC would safeguard plant species and their habitats.

Statements of regional groups, Parties and major groupings of civil society organizations

29. Statements were made, and questions posed, by representatives of Chile, Costa Rica, Egypt, Germany, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Mexico, Senegal, South Africa (on behalf of the African Group), Sweden and the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland.

30. Additional statements were made, and questions posed, by representatives of the CBD Alliance, the Global Youth Biodiversity Network, the Women's Caucus and subnational and local governments.⁵

Egypt

31. The representative of Egypt asked how best to communicate the important outcomes of the fifth edition of the *Global Biodiversity Outlook* to the upcoming United Nations Biodiversity Summit. The news in the *Outlook* had not been good, and it was important to convince the leaders of the world to change their policies toward the conservation of biodiversity. At the same time, he asked how the outcomes of the session would be taken up in the post-2020 global biodiversity framework.

Islamic Republic of Iran

32. The representative of the Islamic Republic of Iran asked whether there had been any assessment of the reasons why most targets had not been met and whether the targets were equally achievable in all

⁵ Responses by the Secretariat to the questions raised on the fifth edition of the *Global Biodiversity Outlook* are provided at: <https://www.cbd.int/conferences/sbstta24-sbi3-prep/sbstta-sbi-ss-01/documents>, since, due to time limitations, it was not possible for the Secretariat to respond the questions during the session.

countries. He asked if it would be possible for the next assessment to simplify the targets for the next period of the implementation of the Convention.

Senegal

33. The representative of Senegal noted that none of the targets had been met despite all the efforts that had been undertaken to do so, and he asked if the fifth edition of the *Global Biodiversity Outlook* had been updated to reflect what had actually been achieved on the ground in the different countries.

South Africa on behalf of the African Group

34. The representative of South Africa, speaking on behalf of the African Group, noted the outcomes of the fifth edition of the *Global Biodiversity Outlook*. It had been almost thirty years since the adoption of the Convention, but despite that, the dramatic decline in biodiversity continued to threaten nature and the well-being of the people who depended on it. The rapid biodiversity loss also had an impact on the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development. The *Outlook* had shown that none of the Aichi Biodiversity Targets would be fully met this year, and that only six of the targets would be partially met. The report also pointed to a number of direct and indirect drivers of biodiversity loss, and recommended that transformative change was required to halt that biodiversity loss and improve human well-being. Some of the reasons for failing to achieve the targets included lack of capacity and adequate resources, but also the framing of the targets themselves. There were opportunities to translate the lessons learned into meaningful recommendations for the future of biodiversity, nature and people. Those included the development of SMART action-oriented targets to inform meaningful action by Parties to reduce biodiversity loss. Such targets needed to be supported by adequate and timely means of implementation, and the mainstreaming of biodiversity into production and other sectors which was a priority if they were to be achieved. The efforts required should include an integrated and coherent approach that simultaneously addressed the loss of the genetic biodiversity and improved the capacity of nature to deliver its benefits to human societies and promote human well-being. They must also address the less developed but highly tangible connections between people and nature that helped to define identities, cultures and beliefs. In closing, he highlighted the risks and opportunities presented by nature: both were mainly dependent on how biodiversity was managed, and that was in humanity's hands.

Germany

35. The representative of Germany said that the fifth edition of the *Global Biodiversity Outlook* presented an alarming summary of the global efforts at the conservation and the sustainable use of biodiversity over the past decade and illustrated how far we were from "Living in harmony with nature". She asked what steps were needed to ensure a determined implementation of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework. There were three key messages from the report. The first was that the implementation of globally agreed targets would only be possible if NBSAPs were aligned with, and complemented, the framework, and if actions to achieve them were adapted to local conditions. The second message was that the post-2020 global biodiversity framework needed a robust reporting and review system, from the global level to the national and even down to the local levels. The national reports, the fifth edition of the *Global Biodiversity Outlook*, the second edition of the *Local Biodiversity Outlooks*, and other international reports, such as those of IPBES, were all needed to constitute a whole picture. Success in bringing all those pieces together would determine the success the post-2020 global biodiversity framework. Finally, true transformative change would not be accomplished by defining SMART targets alone. The eight "transitions to sustainable pathways" in the *Outlook* clearly spelled out what needed to be done in various sectors, but defining pathways would also not guarantee the achievement of the 2050 Vision of "Living in harmony with nature". The challenge lay in taking a whole-of-society approach that treated the biodiversity crisis with the same level of attention and action as the global COVID-19 pandemic.

Chile

36. The representative of Chile welcomed the development and dissemination of the fifth edition of the *Global Biodiversity Outlook*, and noted that it would be particularly useful to introduce its main conclusions at the United Nations Biodiversity Summit and at the same time outline the critical state of global

biodiversity. She stressed the importance of the report and welcomed its wide dissemination, which would guide countries in designing and developing programmes, strategies and regulations for the recovery of specific ecosystems and in particular the post COVID-19 economic recovery. She suggested the development of a series of short videos that presented the key messages and fundamental findings of the *Outlook* in simple and clear language which could be shared on the Internet and go viral through social networks, to bring that message to the public. That would contribute to environmental education as a step forward to start living in harmony with nature.

United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland

37. The representative of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland said that despite the significant efforts and good progress made in some areas, the Aichi Biodiversity Targets had not been fully achieved. Nature continued its steep decline, but it was not too late to slow, halt and eventually reverse that negative trend, and the actions required were also crucial to achieving the Paris Agreement and the Sustainable Development Goals. That required conserving and restoring biodiversity, keeping climate change to well below 2°C, and achieving sustainable production and consumption. That clear message had to be communicated at the United Nations Biodiversity Summit, and elsewhere outside the narrow scope of the biodiversity convention. The lessons learned from the current Strategic Plan had to be put into practice, and, in particular, global goals and targets had to be formulated in clear and simple language, with quantitative elements to drive actions by all sectors of society. National ambition had to increase, and NBSAPs had to be updated, with improved implementation and the mainstreaming of biodiversity across all sectors. A much more effective reporting and review mechanism was needed that would track individual and collective efforts and allow actions to be stepped up where progress had been insufficient. The fifth edition of the *Global Biodiversity Outlook* was a frank and sobering assessment but it was not too late to act, and his Government was fully committed to working with all Parties and stakeholders to put in place, and implement, an ambitious global framework; it was also committed to bringing nature to the forefront of discussions during the meeting of the Conference of the Parties to the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change which his Government would host in November 2021.

Costa Rica

38. The representative of Costa Rica congratulated the Secretariat on the presentation of the fifth edition of the *Global Biodiversity Outlook* which was one of the main indicators of the progress made in setting ambitious targets for natural protected areas. Aichi Target 11 had helped to establish protected terrestrial and marine protected areas to protect 17 per cent of the land and 10 per cent of the oceans by 2020. Considering the success that had already been achieved, it should be possible to exceed those targets. However, in the past decade it had not been possible to establish those areas that were most important to conserve biodiversity or most representative of global biodiversity, and which needed to be managed effectively. The *Outlook* had found that it was necessary to significantly increase the extent and effectiveness of protected areas, which was in line with the overwhelming scientific consensus that at least 30 per cent of the Earth's land and water had to be protected by 2030. The *Outlook* supported that consensus, and the need for greater coverage of protected areas, especially as the effectiveness of such measures had already been demonstrated. Priority had to be given to those protected areas with rich biodiversity, and to ensuring that the protected areas were managed equitably, which was not currently an element of Action Target 2 of the global biodiversity framework despite being an element of Aichi Biodiversity Target 11. Further progress was needed in developing the target to ensure that equitable management was explicitly included in Action Target 2.

Mexico

39. The representative of Mexico said that the COVID-19 pandemic had made clear how urgent it was to improve humanity's relationship with nature; our own survival was at stake. She welcomed the decision to make the fifth edition of the *Global Biodiversity Outlook* public before the United Nations Biodiversity Summit, an event that should give impetus to the global commitments required to halt biodiversity loss. She emphasized that the main conclusions of the *Outlook* were not encouraging and that if the current trajectory was maintained, biodiversity and the services it provided would continue to decline, putting at

risk the achievement of the Sustainable Development Goals and the well-being of societies. However, the *Outlook* also presented encouraging transitions that, if implemented, could mean a more sustainable future. To that end, unified efforts had to be made to achieve the post-2020 global biodiversity framework, through goals and targets that would promote actions to protect lands, forests and oceans and would ensure the sustainable use of water and agriculture, combat climate change, and strengthen human health and ecosystems; Mexico called for the information contained in the *Outlook* to be considered in the preparation of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework. Countries also had to achieve the necessary agreements to emerge from the environmental crisis, which unfortunately had been exacerbated during the current year, so that now more than ever those efforts had to be redoubled.

Sweden

40. The representative of Sweden paid tribute to the those who had produced the fifth edition of the *Global Biodiversity Outlook* during a difficult time. The economic and social effects of the global COVID-19 pandemic, that few could have imagined, had not been evenly distributed; but while the biodiversity crisis was not nearly as well recognized, it could have much more devastating and long-lasting effects if the negative trends were not halted. The loss of biodiversity was interdependently connected to other global challenges such as climate change, land degradation, food security and human health. The *Global Biodiversity Outlook* showed how urgent determined responses by governments, but also by the whole of society, were needed. When looking for solutions to the different crises that faced humanity it was clear that biodiversity offered the solutions, or important parts of the solutions, to many of them. It was the task of the biodiversity community to find the most effective ways to communicate that fact to the rest of society. Crises of different sorts would certainly follow humanity into the future, and while it was not possible to foresee their nature and severity, the need to respond to them would be ours. The obvious response was to build more resilience into societies, making them shockproof to the effects of unforeseen events. To do that, the restoration of biodiversity, and its wise use, was essential, along with achieving and protecting such social assets as democracy, equality, justice and education for all. He suggested the joining of virtual hands to work together on the path to the fifteenth meeting of the Conference of the Parties and to achieving the vision of the biodiversity convention: Living in harmony with nature.

Global Youth Biodiversity Network

41. The representative of the Global Youth Biodiversity Network (GYBN) said that the fifth edition of the *Global Biodiversity Outlook* had shed some light on the path towards creating a healthier, more equitable and inclusively prosperous future. The information and the compelling evidence it presented reinforced calls for system-wide transformative change, which was the only chance of a future of living in harmony within nature. If the current generations were already suffering the consequences of the biodiversity crisis, he asked what life would be for the generations to come. His generation was aware of how vital biodiversity was to human society; its aspirations and ideals for a healthier relationship between nature and humanity were driven not just by compassion, justice, and hope, but also by necessity and fear of the consequences of failure. It had to be recognized that young people were key stakeholders and actors in decision-making at every level, because with the full and effective participation of young people in environmental decision-making, and with the recognition of intergenerational equity, the next edition of the *Global Biodiversity Outlook* would tell a more progressive story. It was important to build on the successes of, and draw lessons from, the failures identified in the fifth edition. Strengthened and renewed multilateralism had to be built on trust and based on international law; it had to be geared towards the overarching goals of peace, security, human rights and sustainable development. While the fifth edition of the *Global Biodiversity Outlook* gave a global picture of the progress made toward the implementation of biodiversity commitments, it remained incomplete and inaccurate without the inclusion of local perspectives and the voices of grassroots movements and other actors on the ground. The support for initiatives such as the second edition of the *Local Biodiversity Outlooks* would make a difference in the reporting of global biodiversity outcomes. As the world collectively strove to recover from the current COVID-19 pandemic, the failure to tackle biodiversity loss systemically was likely to restore a business-as-usual approach which would leave the world vulnerable to another such pandemic. Time was running out, but together and across the generations, the world that everyone wanted and deserved could be created.

Women's Caucus

42. The representative of the Women's Caucus said that the fifth edition of the *Global Biodiversity Outlook* had marked the end of the Aichi era. The insufficient efforts it recorded were haunting and raised questions regarding what had to happen for humanity to act with enough ambition to move towards coexistence with nature and collective, equitable action. She was concerned at the continuous invisibility of women's rights, roles, needs and priorities in biodiversity decision-making that affected their lives and those of their communities. She was concerned at the failure of the recognition of women's full, effective and meaningful participation, engagement and knowledge related to sustainable use of biodiversity. She was deeply concerned about the growing gender-based violence in the environmental sector, particularly against women and girls who defend their land and territories, and she called attention to the increase in their workloads due to gender roles as well as the dangers associated with the misnamed natural disasters resulting from ecosystems degradation. Those trends concerned her mainly because the rising combined curves of inequality and biodiversity loss hindered women and girls from the enjoyment of full lives and their right to a healthy environment. The *Outlook* had highlighted that there was a need to strengthen the integration of gender, the role of indigenous peoples and local communities and the level of stakeholder engagement. It had noted that in the NBSAPs submitted to date, gender considerations were reflected by less than half of the Parties. Despite the efforts that some Parties had made to address gender considerations in their biodiversity policies, more needed to be done. Women and girls were more than a reference, they were more than a word, they were half of the population of the World and the agents of change and champions in sustainable use of biodiversity, they were the first-line actors in the management and conservation of biodiversity. Women and girls were key knowledge holders and played an integral role in the intergenerational transfer of knowledge and the conservation of genetic diversity; women and girls should be fully integrated into the transition strategies proposed by the *Outlook*. Some of the recommendations presented in the *Outlook* were welcome but the task was how those would be integrated fully and further strengthened and implemented in the post-2020 global biodiversity framework. The new Gender Plan of Action could help turn those recommendations into actions and ensure social, economic and environmental justice of and for women and girls in the biodiversity sector.

Global network of subnational and local governments

43. The representative of the global network of subnational and local governments said that the tenth meeting of the Conference of the Parties, held in Aichi-Nagoya, had given birth to the Strategic Plan 2011-2020, including the Aichi Biodiversity Targets. That meeting also adopted a plan of action on subnational governments, cities and other local authorities for biodiversity. Over the past decade, subnational and local governments, and their networks, had achieved a great deal, both individually and collectively. Those efforts and achievements had contributed to, and had been in line with, those of the Parties, which was why actively and formally involving subnational and local governments was one of the priorities that should be pursued in this and future decades. At the second meeting of the Subsidiary Body on Implementation, his network had called for Parties to cooperate with subnational and local governments when preparing their sixth national reports, and he was pleased to find that the fifth edition of the *Global Biodiversity Outlook* had recognized the importance of cities and subnational planning, which would encourage his group to act in the coming decade. He hoped that the ongoing preparatory process toward the fifteenth meeting of the Conference of the Parties would consider a more ambitious role for, and recognition of, the importance of subnational and local governments in implementing the new global biodiversity framework.

CBD Alliance

44. The representative of the CBD Alliance expressed his solidarity with all those who were suffering from the COVID-19 pandemic, particularly the most vulnerable groups, and hoped that the present crisis would be an opportunity for governments and countries to change the paradigm of their development models. He thanked the Secretariat and the Bureau for the efforts made to hold the virtual meeting and to ensure active, equitable and fair participation. With respect to conservation and restoration as nature-based solutions, he said that while they had been mentioned in the fifth edition of the *Global Biodiversity Outlook* they were not otherwise defined in the Convention. That caused problems for civil society, as did the lack of any references to rights in an otherwise lengthy text, and he asked why those references had been omitted.

He also asked whether there would be any mention of differentiated responsibilities between developing and developed countries when attempting to “bend the curve”. It was necessary to address the underlying structural causes of biodiversity loss and focus on that rather than on the selling of ecosystem services.

Summation by the Chair

45. In summing up, the Chair said a number of interventions had welcomed the fifth edition of the *Global Biodiversity Outlook* and had noted the importance of acting now to address the state of biodiversity that had been reflected in the report. The key messages of the report were that when implemented policies and management worked, and that science and modelling were making it clear that transformational change was possible. If all worked closely together, that positive message could be used to encourage action now, in particular for the eight transitions to living in harmony with nature. The launch had happened in advance of the United Nations Biodiversity Summit, which should take up the elements of the report, and especially the key messages it contained. He invited the Parties and observers to fully use the report for the next steps in preparation for the post-2020 global biodiversity framework, and encouraged Parties and all interested stakeholders to use the report and its findings in their communications in support of urgent action on biodiversity, conservation and sustainable use. The results should also be widely disseminated through education, awareness and other initiatives. In closing, he thanked the team that had worked on the report, and in particular the Deputy Executive Secretary, as well as the contributors and all those who had provided their valuable comments.

ITEM 3. CLOSURE OF THE SPECIAL SESSION

46. After the customary exchange of courtesies, the special virtual session of the Subsidiary Body on Scientific, Technical and Technological Advice was closed at 9.10 a.m. on Tuesday, 15 September 2020.

II. REPORT ON THE SPECIAL SESSION OF THE SUBSIDIARY BODY ON IMPLEMENTATION

ITEM 1. OPENING OF THE SPECIAL SESSION

47. The special session of the Subsidiary Body on Implementation was opened at 7 a.m. on Wednesday, 16 September 2020, by Ms. Charlotta Sörqvist (Sweden), Chair of the Subsidiary Body, who welcomed the participants. She thanked the Bureau of the Conference of the Parties for its support and the Executive Secretary and her staff for the preparations made for the special virtual session. She said that much positive feedback and support had been received from previous day's session of the Subsidiary Body on Scientific, Technical and Technological Advice, but also noted that some challenges had also been experienced, especially with respect to the number of statements that could be made in the short time available. The reduced time for interpretation had also contributed to those challenges.

48. The focus of the present session would be the testing of a Party-led review process, through an open-ended forum which had originally been planned for the third meeting of the Subsidiary Body on Implementation. However, due to ongoing uncertainties related to the COVID-19 pandemic, and the new dates for the third meeting of the Subsidiary Body on Implementation, she had requested that the Bureau consider holding the trial phase online in advance of that meeting, to which the Bureau had agreed. She said that the main objectives of the open-ended forum were to undertake country-by-country reviews of the implementation of the Convention, increase transparency regarding the actions undertaken, present the successes and challenges encountered, facilitate peer learning among Parties, and identify strategic actions to overcome obstacles in national implementation. The open-ended forum would be followed by a short session on resource mobilization.

49. Opening statements were made by Ms. Elizabeth Maruma Mrema, Executive Secretary of the Convention on Biological Diversity, and Mr. Hamdallah Zedan on behalf of Ms. Yasmine Fouad, Minister of Environment of Egypt and President of the Conference of the Parties. The statement of Mr. Zedan was read by Mr. Moustafa Fouda (Egypt).

50. Mr. Moustafa Fouda, speaking on behalf of Ms. Yasmine Fouad, Minister of Environment of Egypt and President of the Conference of the Parties, welcomed the participants and expressed the hope that both they and their loved ones were well during these difficult times and his solidarity with them wherever they were in the world. He recalled that during the launch of the fifth edition of the *Global Biodiversity Outlook*, the participants had heard that progress towards both the implementation of the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020 and the Aichi Biodiversity Targets had been insufficient and that significant efforts were required, at all levels, to increase the level of implementation of the Convention and develop the post-2020 global biodiversity framework. Planning, monitoring, reporting and review had a critical role in helping to accomplish that and had to be strengthened.

51. That message had been reinforced through the submissions of Parties, partners, and other stakeholders; and the discussions held at regional and thematic workshops and consultations held during the year. In decision [14/29](#), the Conference of the Parties had decided to explore the development of an enhanced review mechanism for the Convention, or an enhanced multidimensional approach to reviewing implementation, to strengthen implementation under the post-2020 global biodiversity framework, and to prepare a Party-led review process to be tested at the third meeting of the Subsidiary Body on Implementation. The expertise and experiences in implementing the Convention in respective countries to date would be invaluable for the development of that enhanced review mechanism, and the present session would stimulate that discussion.

52. The present session would also hear a report from the panel of experts on resource mobilization. Mr. Fouda recalled decision [14/22](#), in which the Conference of the Parties had affirmed that resource mobilization would be an integral part of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework. The fourteenth meeting of the Conference of the Parties had requested the Executive Secretary to contract a panel of experts to undertake preparatory work on resource mobilization and on several aspects related to the development of the resource mobilization components, in order to inform the work of both the Open-ended Working Group on the Post-2020 Global Biodiversity Framework (Open-ended Working Group) and the Conference

of the Parties. He was convinced that they could provide meaningful input to discussions during the third meeting of the Subsidiary Body on Implementation, and formulate sound recommendations for submission to the third meeting of the Open-ended Working Group, and to the fifteenth meeting of the Conference of the Parties, for their respective consideration.

53. The Executive Secretary welcomed the participants to the special virtual session of the Subsidiary Body on Implementation, and offered her sincere thanks to the Government of Egypt for joining the session, which sought to harness the latest communication technology and take a virtual step forward in the intergovernmental process. Despite the COVID-19 pandemic, and the disruption it brought, efforts had been redoubled to conserve and protect biodiversity and nature. When the fifth edition of the *Global Biodiversity Outlook* had been launched, a number of requests for the floor could not be accommodated due to the limited time available. She said that there would be other opportunities to make interventions on the *Outlook*, and the other issues being discussed during the course of the week, at the full meetings of the Subsidiary Body on Scientific, Technical and Technological Advice and the Subsidiary Body on Implementation in the coming months.

54. It was fitting that the special session for the Subsidiary Body on Implementation began with the review of implementation. The fourteenth meeting of the Conference of the Parties had considered review mechanisms for the Convention, and had requested the organization and testing of a Party-led review process, including through an open-ended forum to be held at the third meeting of the Subsidiary Body on Implementation. At the present special session, five Parties representing the five United Nations regional groups had agreed to participate in the trial phase of the country-by-country review process. Each of the five Parties had prepared a review report,⁶ complementing their sixth national reports, on their efforts to implement the Convention and the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020, and each would engage in an exchange of questions and answers to provide further insights. She thanked those five Parties for their willingness to take the stage and the other Parties that had read the review reports and had sent in questions for the session. The insights and perspectives provided during the trial phase of the open-ended forum would be essential for advancing the consideration of review mechanisms at the third meeting of the Subsidiary Body on Implementation. She was confident that the reports would also provide the global community with tangible evidence of genuine progress toward biodiversity conservation and protection. They would show the world that it was on the way towards establishing a new relationship with its vital natural capital: one that was safer, healthier, more sustainable and inclusive. The reports would also help it to better understand some of the difficulties faced, so that efforts could be continually improved on, and she looked forward to the presentation and the discussions.

55. The special session would also consider resource mobilization, an issue as complex and challenging as it was vital. At the fourteenth meeting of the Conference of the Parties, the Parties had affirmed that resource mobilization would be an integral part of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework, and had requested that a panel of experts prepare reports on issues related to the development of resource mobilization, which would help inform the work of the Open-ended Working Group on the Post-2020 Global Biodiversity Framework and the Conference of the Parties. The availability of adequate and predictable financial resources was essential for effective implementation of the Convention. However, ensuring such resource mobilization would require a transformative, inclusive and equitable change across all economies and society at large. While that challenge might seem formidable, she was optimistic that the insights provided by the panel, along with the thoughtful perspectives of the participants, could help to collectively chart a path forward and help the world build more resilient economic systems.

ITEM 2. PRESENTATION OF REVIEW REPORTS

56. The Chair said each presentation would be followed by a 15-minute question and answer session. She recalled the notification issued on 14 August 2020 that had invited Parties to examine the review reports and submit any questions to the Secretariat that they would like addressed during the open-ended forum, stating clearly for which Party or Parties they were intended. As indicated in the agreed procedure for this

⁶ See <https://www.cbd.int/convention/mechanisms/trial-phase.shtml>.

trial phase, the five presenting countries had selected questions, from among those received from other Parties by the deadline, to respond to during the session. Consequently, in view of the agreed procedure and the limited time for the present meeting she would not entertain any other questions at the present session.

Presentation by Sri Lanka

57. The representative of Sri Lanka introduced Sri Lanka's review report and provided background information on the location of the country, and its biodiversity, following which she reviewed the actions that had been taken to implement the Convention and the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020, including legislative actions, which were more fully described in the document.

58. The country had identified several threats to biodiversity: over-exploitation, habitat loss, degradation and fragmentation, the spread of invasive alien species, all forms of pollution, population pressure, human-wildlife conflict, and biopiracy were major causes of the loss of biodiversity in Sri Lanka. New research also indicated that the impact of climate change had aggravated those threats further. To conserve and sustainably use its globally significant biodiversity, Sri Lanka had signed the Convention on Biological Diversity in 1992, had ratified it in 1994, had prepared its first national biodiversity strategy and action plan (NBSAP) in 1998 and an addendum to its NBSAP in 2007. Its second NBSAP had been prepared for the 2016-2022 period and was being implemented using an ecosystem-based approach that was more consistent with current approaches to biodiversity conservation. It was also linked to achieving the Aichi Biodiversity Targets and the Sustainable Development Goals, and had five strategic objectives: to ensure the long-term conservation of biodiversity, to promote the sustainable use of biological resources, to conserve biodiversity, to promote the equitable sharing of benefits from biodiversity and to improve human well-being through an ecosystem approach. Twelve targets with 87 activities had been established to meet those objectives, and she described which activities were linked to the different targets and goals, and how effective Sri Lanka had been in meeting those targets.

59. Among the outcomes of those actions was the establishment of a national "red list" of threatened species which also served as a database for Sri Lanka's indigenous species. With respect to other activities she gave the examples of butterfly farms, control of invasive alien aquatic species, and the legal tools developed for protected areas. Protected areas comprised, inter alia, 1,951,473 hectares of natural forest cover, or 29.7 per cent of the total land area of the country, which exceeded the Aichi Target, although marine protected areas only amounted to 0.3 per cent of Sri Lanka's territorial waters. The different categories of forests were more fully described in the document.

60. She highlighted the conclusions of the sixth national report, and issues of technical and financial resources and expenditure. She said that according to a review of expenditures, the disbursements for biodiversity had been gradually increasing from 2010 to 2015. She then listed a number of the unresolved challenges of implementation, such as the absence of an appropriate multi-tiered structure to monitor implementation of the NBSAP and the lack of clear roles and responsibilities among the different government agencies. She also said that there was a poor understanding of the potential offered by biodiversity for national development, as well as a lack of trained staff to prepare compelling project proposals, and that there was a need to establish an effective decision-making support system and additional capacity-building.

Sri Lanka's response to questions

61. In response to a request for clarification of sections 1 to 12 of the review report and a query about the status of the actions or planned measures to achieve the stated targets of the Sustainable Development Goals, the representative of Sri Lanka said that when addressing its first target, Sri Lanka had prepared, with stakeholder consultation, its "red list" of endangered species, to which all research communities had contributed. Actions had also been taken to disseminate that information among the public through publications and electronic media. There had been several training programmes for local communities as well. She said, with respect to the status of the action plan, that the NBSAP had been prepared in line with the Sustainable Development Goals. For example, Sustainable Development Goal 15.1, which was to ensure the conservation, restoration and sustainable use of terrestrial and inland freshwater ecosystems and

their services by 2020, had been linked to Sri Lanka's national target 3, while its national target 2 was linked to the achievement of Sustainable Development Goal 15.2. Sri Lanka had undertaken several actions to restore its ecosystems, such as the restoration of mango forests, but other ecosystems were also being restored through the use of natural regeneration tools. Sustainable Development Goal 15.8 also had been addressed through Sri Lanka's national target 2, and the development of a national policy for invasive alien species management, and research had been undertaken to identify the proper mechanisms to control those invasive species. Protocols had been created to identify potential invasive species before they entered the country, as well as for identifying those that already existed.

62. In response to a query requesting an example of businesses having benefited from investing in biodiversity conservation and at the same time having helped to achieve the national targets, the representative of Sri Lanka said that while tourism had led to the destruction of some biodiversity such as marine species, ecotourism was a business tool to protect biodiversity; so that tourist facilities could be created without at the same time destroying biodiversity. Another example of a business that could benefit from biodiversity was the labelling of products from Sri Lanka with eco-labels and thus use of that business base to protect the ecosystem.

63. The representative of Sri Lanka also responded to a query about the usefulness and "added value" of the voluntary peer review as a means of identifying both gaps in NBSAP implementation and the capacity-building needs that had been previously overlooked. The representative of Sri Lanka said that voluntary peer review had been used for both the sixth national report and the NBSAP. For the NBSAP there had been an international team that had a variety of experience, while for the sixth national report only national experts had been used. Voluntary peer review had been used with the international group, which had been able to share its knowledge and experience with local experts to improve national targets and activities. She said that was the main experience that Sri Lanka had taken from voluntary peer review.

Presentation by Ethiopia

64. The representative of Ethiopia presented Ethiopia's review report, and said that when updating its NBSAP 2011-2020, it had assigned an NBSAP coordinator, created a project steering committee and developed annual work plans. The updated NBSAP comprised 18 targets, which had been mapped to the Aichi Biodiversity Targets, as well as 42 indicators and 58 actions. A total of 10 lead implementing federal institutions had coordinated the specific actions, with the Ethiopian Biodiversity Institute serving as the national focal point responsible for overall implementation. That Institute had coordinated the establishment and functioning of the National Biodiversity Technical Committee (NBTC), the National Biodiversity Council (NBC), the timing of the meetings of the NBTC and the NBC, as well as the reporting format and the reporting time for the implementing agencies.

65. The outcomes expected from Parties for the Strategic Plan 2011-2020 were the development or revision of their NBSAPs and the submission of the fifth and sixth national reports. Ethiopia had revised its NBSAP 2015-2020 and had submitted it to the Secretariat in 2015. It had also submitted its fifth national report, which had been incorporated into the fourth edition of the *Global Biodiversity Outlook*, and had submitted its sixth national report in April 2019. The fifth national report had shown that Ethiopia had implemented nine of the Aichi Biodiversity Targets very well, and that implementation had been good for a further five of the targets and fair for the remaining four. The sixth national report had shown that Ethiopia had been effective beyond expectation in implementing ten of the national targets, had been partially effective in the implementation of a further seven targets, and had not been effective only in the implementation of one target.

66. While the implementation of Ethiopia's NBSAP 2015-2020 had planned on being mainly conducted using the available national capacity, some additional technical support had been obtained from other sources, such as the support that had been secured by lead institutions from different sources through their own institutional efforts. Out of the estimated total cost of the implementation of the updated NBSAP 2015-2020, 55 per cent of the expenses had been covered by the national budget while the rest were secured from other sources.

67. The requirement to adjust the current NBSAP to plan effectively for the post-2020 global biodiversity framework was both national and international. The national needs involved engaging in awareness-raising efforts with policymakers and the general public on the value of biodiversity and ecosystem services; strengthening the NBSAP coordination structure; strengthening the mechanisms that enforced the implementation of the agreed updating and implementation arrangements; locating, lobbying for and securing additional internal sources of funding from non-governmental sources such as the private sector; and refining and fine-tuning the alignment of national targets with the corresponding global targets.

68. Similarly, the international needs involved establishing a well understood globally shared Vision, Mission, and Goals, such as those found in the Aichi Biodiversity Targets; organizing relevant capacity-building events; bringing Parties to an equal understanding of the NBSAP process; encouraging Parties to take part in capacity-building events and refrain from regularly changing their delegates; facilitating the early communication and timely release of the allocated funds by the Secretariat and the Global Environment Facility (GEF); and living up to the commitments that had been made.

69. Additionally, there was also a need to address the challenges associated with the satisfactory engagement of stakeholders, the physical auditing of the reported implementation, and designating representative protected areas across the ecosystems of the country.

Ethiopia's response to questions

70. In response to a query about the lack of clear baselines to demonstrate the rate of change or progress when achieving its targets, the representative of Ethiopia explained that it had not been possible to include all issues of note in the review report. Despite that, most of the 18 targets also had baselines established, and he gave the example of the baselines for national biodiversity targets 8, 9 and 11, and explained how the baselines had been used to measure the achievement of those targets.

71. In response to a query about the lessons learned from the countries that had tried to achieve synergies with other biodiversity-related conventions, and whether the focal points of other conventions were involved in development and implementation of the NBSAPs, the representative of Ethiopia said that in the case of Ethiopia many of the focal points of those other conventions were housed together in the same institution, the Environment, Forest and Climate Change Commission of Ethiopia. Consequently, they had been involved in the stocktaking exercise that had taken place. Some of the focal points of those conventions had also been members of the NBTC and had been involved in the development of some of the targets, as well as in the stakeholder workshops; some of the workshops had even been run by them.

72. In response to a query about the lessons learned from the implementation of the NBSAP and whether, based on Ethiopia's experience, it would recommend the review process as a mechanism to be integrated into the post-2020 global biodiversity framework for strengthening accountability, the representative of Ethiopia agreed that it would be good to integrate such a review process into the post-2020 global biodiversity framework, as it would help countries to learn from their failures as well as their successes and offered a better understanding of the implementation of the Convention in the country.

Presentation by Poland

73. The representative of Poland presented her country's review report, which was based on its sixth national report. That report had been submitted on 14 February 2019, and its NBSAP had been adopted by the Council of Ministers in November 2015, transforming into national obligations the Global Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020 and the Biodiversity Strategy of the European Union. The NBSAP had one overarching goal, seven objectives and multiple targets. The seven objectives were an improved level of knowledge and an increase in social activities; improved nature protection systems; preservation and restoration of natural habitats and endangered species; maintaining and reconstruction of ecosystems providing services for the human population; integrating the economic sectors with biodiversity objectives; reducing threats from climate change and invasive alien species; and increasing the participation of Poland in international forums on the subject of biodiversity. She illustrated the objectives by giving various examples of actions Poland had taken which were more fully described in the report. With respect to technical and financial resources, she said that the Chief Inspectorate of Environmental Protection and 16

regional inspectors were responsible for biodiversity monitoring and checking on users of genetic resources. Funding had come from the National Fund for Environmental Protection and Water Management, 16 regional funds, and the financial programmes of the European Union, the European Economic Area, Norway Grants and the Swiss Fund. She said that the funding disbursed for biodiversity amounted to US\$ 354 million annually.

74. With respect to the need to adjust the NBSAP, she said it had been developed in the period 2014-2015 and needed to be revised and updated according to current priorities. The new NBSAP would be based on the post-2020 global biodiversity framework and the new biodiversity strategy of the European Union, taking into account national conditions and circumstances. With respect to unresolved challenges, she said that several targets in the current NBSAP would probably not be reached by the end of the present year, and that the main reasons for that were insufficient human and financial resources; insufficient promotion of biodiversity issues within the whole of society; and insufficient cooperation between stakeholders.

Poland's response to questions

75. In response to a query about Poland's objectives D and F, and the expected or actual outcomes of the project "Developing Adaptation Plans for Climate Change in Cities with over 100,000 Residents", the representative of Poland said that the project was innovative and that its major objective was the assessment of sensitivity to climate change in 44 of the largest cities in Poland, and the planning of adaptation activities that were appropriate for the threats that had been identified. Given the scope of the initiative, it was, to her knowledge, the only one in Europe in which a Minister of the Environment had supported so many local authorities and administrations for adaptation activities at the same time. The development of urban adaptation plans in 44 cities, together with a parallel project that addressed the capital, Warsaw, would contribute to protecting approximately 30 per cent of the Polish population from the effects of climate change, which would at the same time help to protect biodiversity. Each of the 44 plans described the relevant city, taking into account their natural, functional and special demographic conditions, as well as their economic potential, the analysis of which was more fully described in the document. All 44 plans had been developed, and almost all of them had already been adopted by local authorities through local legal instruments. The cost of the project had been more than €7 million, the funding for which had come from the budget of the Cohesion Fund of the European Union. She said that the project had run from January 2017 until 2019, and that in March of 2020 there had been a follow-up initiative entitled "Cities with Climate", with the aim of improving the quality of life of residents and supporting the cities in transforming into climate friendly and climate neutral cities.

76. In response to a request to further elaborate on the actions described in the review report and how they contributed to the achievement of Poland's national goals, and the level of that progress, the representative of Poland said when the actions that had been undertaken had been analysed, it was found that 53 per cent of them had been effective, while only two percent of actions were considered to have been ineffective. For other activities no evaluation had been possible due to a lack of relevant information on the status of implementation. The assessment of progress in meeting the national objectives showed that none of the seven objectives would be achieved by the end of 2020, and that while progress had been made on four objectives, for one target, participation in international forums, there had actually been movement in the other direction. No assessment had been possible for two of the objectives due to a lack of indicators. Indicators were in fact the key to the assessment of the actions and targets. However, different indicators had been approved for the actions and the targets, and while indicators could not cover the whole range of activities, or an entire activity, it sometimes occurred that the indicators that had been included in the NBSAPs were actually inappropriate. Given the difficulty presented by the indicators, a second assessment had been made based on the opinion of experts, in the form of a survey that had been sent to more than 130 research institutes and 70 non-governmental organizations. Most of those responding had indicated that Poland was on track to achieve its national objectives; however, due to the subjectivity of those opinions, and the rather low response rate, that study constituted limited evidence of progress on the implementation of national targets. With respect to implementation, she said that for Poland, Aichi Biodiversity Targets 1, 3, 4, 5, and 6 required further effort.

Presentation by Finland

77. The representative of Finland introduced the review report on the implementation of the Convention in Finland, which had been based on the recently published *Impact Assessment of the Implementation of the National Strategy and Action Plan for the Conservation and Sustainable use of Biodiversity in Finland (2012–2020)*. As background, he presented the timeline of the actions undertaken to implement the Convention in Finland which had culminated in the impact assessment. He said that since 1996 there had been a broad-based national biodiversity working group made up of most of the ministries of the Government as well as a number of state authorities, research institutes, the Sami parliament, local government, the business sector and non-governmental organizations. With respect to the implementation of the Convention and the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity, he said that Finland had 5 goals and 20 national targets that were in line with the global Strategic Plan and the Aichi Biodiversity Targets, and while they had been slightly modified to account for national circumstances, they were 90 per cent the same. The national action plan also had 105 national actions that covered 24 themes.

78. With respect to legislative action, he listed the laws that had an impact on biodiversity that had been redrafted in recent years, and explained that two of the most important laws affecting biodiversity, the Nature Conservation Act and the Land Use and Building Act, were currently under revision. He presented an example of how the 105 different actions were reviewed and said that 56 per cent of them had resulted in a positive trend in terms of the development they sought to achieve. He said that Finland would make an effort to improve that percentage. He also said that the most pronounced improving trends were often observed in actions with a low level of ambition. A slightly improving trend had also been observed in the case of actions which had been partially implemented, and those for which implementation had started late in the period of the NBSAP or which dealt with new ways of operating. The actions with a stable trend, on the other hand, had often been implemented as part of the work that had to be carried out anyway. Finally, the declining trend related to development cooperation was due to cutbacks in the general funding for development cooperation.

79. He said that the allocation of financial resources often revealed a great deal about what was being focused on. For some of the actions in the NBSAP, which had received a great deal of investment, the main focus had been on some activity other than biodiversity. There had also been actions in which investments made had been small but had yielded a marked positive development or had great potential to do so in the future. There were also five actions that simultaneously had a high level of financial allocation and moderate impact but also great future potential, and in those cases, resources had been successfully invested in actions that had or could yield considerable results.

80. Finally, with respect to the need for adjusting the NBSAP, he observed that it was important to consider the impact of the actions during the period of the NBSAP separately from the potential impact of the actions. Most of the actions had only a low impact during that period but had a great deal more potential for the future. It was considered that for the next NBSAP, the actions needed to be SMART, have concrete outcomes, and be accompanied by indicators on implementation, trends and resources. There also needed to be fewer actions, and it was considered that 105 actions were far too many to monitor effectively. With respect to the unresolved challenges, he said that Finland had a realistic chance to reverse the trend in the loss of biodiversity, especially as many new means of improving the state of nature had been developed over the past 25 years. However, halting the loss of biodiversity required a strong commitment from the whole of society and an ecological transition that permeated all of its functions. He explained that by ecological transition he meant transformative change that took biodiversity into account in all decision-making, turning from increasing or continuing pressures on biodiversity to a net positive impact on nature. By far the largest unresolved challenges were commitment, resources and accountability, but recently there had been increasing political and economic interest in safeguarding biodiversity.

Finland's response to questions

81. In response to the observation that forest species had been assessed as seriously threatened, and a query about what measures Finland had been taking in the forest sector to address biodiversity issues, the representative of Finland said that forestry was an important issue in Finland, both in terms of its importance

for the economy and employment, and as a pressure on biodiversity. Roughly 90 per cent of forest area was in commercial use and most of it was being used quite intensively, although those forests were seminatural in character as Finland did not have any forestry plantations. Commercial forestry was the single biggest threat to species in Finland and so there had been two types of measures taken in relation to forests: those aiming at expanding the network of protected forest areas and those aimed at transforming forestry operations. In terms of protection, the main measure had been the METSO Forest Biodiversity Programme, which had a specific focus on the southern half of the country. That programme had been successful in many ways, especially in creating more positive attitudes towards the protection of biodiversity. However, its overall goal of protecting approximately 100,000 hectares of forest by 2025 was quite meagre, as that amounted to approximately 0.5 per cent of the total forest area. Measures within commercial forest management included measures aimed at increasing the volume of dead wood and of structural heterogeneity and measures aimed at sparing habitats that were especially rich in biodiversity. In practice, those measures included forest certification with criteria for leaving retention trees and buffer zones, applying continuous growth forestry, and creating and improving information systems that allowed for the safeguarding of threatened species and habitats. Much work had also been done to utilize geospatial information, so that forestry operators in the field would know what to do and what not to do, and where.

82. In response to a query about the proposals Finland had prepared for the next NBSAP, and the extent to which Finland would take into account the goals and targets of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework when doing so, the representative of Finland said that the national review process has been extremely important for Finland's priority setting. Such reviews were important both for measuring the efficiency and effectiveness of implementation and for priority setting in the future. The lessons learned from the two rounds of review and impact assessments had been positive and had been reported to the government and the public; there had been good coverage in the media and it had been well received by the public. The proposals for future actions were the work of various researchers, and would be considered for and be a part of the post-2020 national plan; but that was not the only source of information. All relevant information would be transferred to the national biodiversity working group, which included all ministries and relevant stakeholders, and which would be in charge of drawing up and revising the new NBSAP. The new NBSAP and action plan for Finland would be ready in 2021, including the post-2020 global biodiversity framework and its goals and targets as an essential part of that work, as well as the biodiversity strategy of the European Union. From that review, it would be known where more needed to be done and where to put resources for successful outcomes.

83. Finally, in response to a query about the lessons learned from countries that had tried to achieve synergies with other biodiversity-related conventions, and whether the focal points of other conventions were involved in development and later the implementation of the NBSAPs, the representative of Finland said that Finland had been involving other biodiversity-related multilateral environmental agreements through its national planning and coordination mechanism, and had also had active dialogues with the chemicals conventions. The national focal points were meeting regularly through the national biodiversity working group, and the preparations for the meetings of the different Conferences of the Parties were being actively followed, as was the work of IPBES and its assessments. Finland was advocating and promoting that on the national level, and believed in synergies, cooperation, integration and exchange of information all levels. That was important for many reasons, inter alia for efficiently using existing resources, good governance, ownership, and for mainstreaming biodiversity into the different sectors of society. Additionally, the relationship between the Sustainable Development Goals and biodiversity was important for Finland's common goals, including the work on indicators, reporting, review and accountability. Involvement of all interested stakeholders was key for successful implementation and ownership of the process. She also underlined that for both mainstreaming and synergies, awareness-raising and communication were key tools. Awareness-raising and media attention had helped with synergies; that was a very good asset that needed to be continued through the national communication group, which was chaired by the Ministry of the Environment and included all relevant communication people, including those from the Finnish public broadcasting system.

Presentation by Guyana

84. The representative of Guyana presented Guyana's review report and background information on his country's accession to and ratification of the Convention of Biological Diversity and its Nagoya Protocol, the country's third, fourth, fifth and sixth national reports, as well as the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020. He said that the country's most recent NBSAP contained nine strategic objectives which were linked to 13 Aichi Biodiversity Targets as well as 31 national targets for the implementation of Guyana's Strategic Plan. He then reviewed each of the strategic objectives, the associated national targets, the measures taken to implement them, and the success achieved in doing so, which was more fully described in the country's review report. With respect to funding, he said that most of the support for the implementation of the strategic plan had come from GEF, although Guyana had also received other funding from, inter alia, various agencies of the United Nations, the International Development Bank, the International Union for Conservation of Nature (IUCN) and the Kreditanstalt für Wiederaufbau. However, while both technical and financial resources had been made available throughout the implementation of the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity, they had often been subject to prioritizing some areas at the expense of others, with the result that there had been an uneven implementation of the plan outside of local enabling activities.

85. With respect to revision of the NBSAP, he said that it would need to be revised as it lacked the depth needed for the effective implementation of the Strategic Plan. The formulation of national targets had been inconsistent with recognized methodologies, which was evident from the lack of corresponding SMART indicators. It also did not include an effective framework for monitoring and reporting implementation. He said that during such a revision of the NBSAP, the targets and mechanisms would need to be amended, as necessary, to adapt to both the national context and the new post-2020 global biodiversity framework.

86. In closing, he said that the challenges encountered in the implementation of the Strategic Plan had remained mostly unresolved, as limited funding and a lack of local technical capacity continued to plague implementation. He also said that political and public awareness also continued to pose a significant challenge.

Guyana's response to questions

87. In response to a query about which factors had supported the measures and achievement of targets 1 and 2, the representative of Guyana said that in setting those targets, Guyana already had in place a national protected areas system, as well as a policy directive on forestry concessions which otherwise would have resulted in biodiversity loss, and it had already been looking at mainstreaming biodiversity in the mining sector, by looking at, inter alia, best practices, awareness and legislation.

88. In answer to questions about whether the review report had been an effective tool in communicating domestic progress towards national biodiversity targets, and what the review report's added value had been in comparison to the sixth national report, the representative of Guyana said that the review report had been prepared for the present forum and had not yet been adopted nationally as a tool but it was foreseen that it would be useful once it was adopted nationally. With respect to its added value in comparison to the sixth national report, she said that the review report was primarily for policymakers and provided the opportunity to internally measure progress.

89. In response to a request to further elaborate as to how the actions described in the review report contributed to the achievement of Guyana's national goals, and what that level of progress was, the representative of Guyana said that it was important to remember that the NBSAP had been developed in consultation with stakeholders and that the Aichi Biodiversity Targets and national targets had been selected based on stakeholder recommendations. However, it also had to be recognized that there were other targets that were also applicable and some work was being done to implement those other targets too, but for those it had not been possible to evaluate progress due to a lack of information. With respect to the final question, she said that it was her view that the review report did not contain actions but was a snapshot of the level of progress on implementation and that the level of progress had been mixed.

Summation by the Chair

90. The Chair thanked all of the speakers for their excellent presentations, which had presented many valuable insights and perspectives that would need to be given consideration. She informed the session that as a follow-up to it, the Secretariat would be circulating an online survey to collect additional feedback and insights, which would be presented to and discussed at the third meeting of the Subsidiary Body on Implementation, in accordance with decision 14/29, and she invited all Parties to actively contribute to that process. While it had not been possible, due to a lack of time, to take additional questions, she urged the participants to submit their questions to the presenters, who would respond to them bilaterally.

ITEM 3. PRESENTATION BY THE PANEL ON RESOURCE MOBILIZATION

91. The Chair of the Subsidiary Body on Implementation said that in decision 14/22, the Conference of the Parties had affirmed that resource mobilization would be an integral part of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework and had requested the Executive Secretary to contract a panel of experts to undertake preparatory work on resource mobilization, and on several aspects related to the development of the resource mobilization component, in order to inform the work of the Open-ended Working Group.

92. She then welcomed the members of the Expert Panel: Ms. Tracey Cumming (South Africa), Mr. Yasha Feferholtz (EcoHealth Alliance), and Mr. Jeremy Eppel (United Kingdom).

Panel presentations

Part I

93. Mr. Jeremy Eppel (United Kingdom) presented the first report of the panel and the key findings of the evaluation and review of the resource mobilization strategy. He said that while the underlying structure of the strategy for resource mobilization was still essentially sound, there were real questions as to how operationally effective the strategy was, especially in developing countries, and there were real challenges with its implementation due to a lack of capacity and a lack of priority being given to biodiversity outside the ministries of environment. Further, issues such as mainstreaming, the removal of harmful subsidies and access and benefit-sharing had only been partially integrated into the strategy's overall goals. There were a range of gaps and shortcomings in the original strategy, such as the failure to address the need for involving the private sector and over-optimism about private sector investment. There had also been an omission of any reference to financial markets and the banking sector, and there was an absence of a time-bound action plan for implementation, as well as too little emphasis on innovative financing, and inadequate comparable and transparent reporting methodologies.

94. According to the recent *A Comprehensive Overview of Global Biodiversity Finance* published by the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD), between US\$ 78 billion and US \$ 91 billion were invested each year in global biodiversity, and of that, approximately US\$ 67.8 billion were domestic public expenditure in developed and developing countries; international biodiversity finance made up only between three and twelve per cent of the total, and private sector expenditure made up a similarly small part of the total. The report also looked at the progress toward the five key resource mobilization targets that had been set by the twelfth meeting of the Conference of the Parties. With respect to target 1 (a), there had been a doubling of international financial flows overall for the period 2015 to 2018. There had also been moderate progress in the inclusion of biodiversity in national plans, target 1 (b), with 68 per cent of respondents reporting some inclusion and 32 per cent reporting comprehensive inclusion. However, with respect to reporting on domestic spending needs, target 1 (c), 75 per cent of respondents reported that the target had not been met. With respect to target 1 (d) only a quarter of reporting Parties had elements of a finance plan, although 83 per cent had been able to undertake some valuation of their domestic biodiversity resources. It was difficult to detect trends as few Parties had established their needs gap, target 1 (e), and established national plans for biodiversity.

95. In closing, he said that the report had concluded that beside generating additional resources, attention had to be paid to redirecting and reducing the harmful use of resources, and better using and accounting for all resources. There had to be enhanced synergies with financing for climate change and the Sustainable Development Goals, as well as the mainstreaming of biodiversity across public and private

sector plans and spending. While it was important to recognize that domestic resources would remain crucial, it was important to integrate biodiversity comprehensively into the business and financial sectors. Governments had to lead by example as well as create a strong enabling framework for others, but none of that would be effective without serious attention being paid to capacity-building.

Part II

96. Mr. Yasha Feferholtz (EcoHealth Alliance), presented the second report and said that the main findings of the report were that the global aggregated annual needs for all activities by 2030 would be seven to eleven times the current estimated levels of US\$ 78 billion to US\$ 91 billion, and that the global investment in protected areas would be four to seven times the current level of US\$ 24.5 billion, or fifteen times larger if compensation costs were included. A more conservative estimate of financial needs would still amount to between US\$ 150 billion and US\$ 300 billion, or between two to four times the current level. If an ambitious global biodiversity framework was implemented, there would be an economic gain for the economy of the world of at least US\$ 500 billion to US\$ 550 billion, or a 0.69 per cent net gain in gross domestic product (GDP). The main messages of the report were as follows: the failure to mobilize adequate resources would have significant global economic costs, with developing countries bearing the largest share of those costs; the estimated need for future funding varied from lower estimates of US\$ 103 billion to US\$ 178 billion annually to higher estimates of US\$ 613 billion to US\$ 895 billion annually, depending on what was included; the financial cost was not prohibitively expensive in terms of global GDP, being from 0.1 per cent and 0.2 per cent of GDP, which could also lead to a high return on that investment in biodiversity; and more data was required from countries to provide accurate assessment of resource mobilization needs and its benefits.

Part III

97. Ms. Tracey Cumming (South Africa) said that the key messages of the third report of the Panel of Experts were that effective resource mobilization would require transformative, inclusive and equitable change across economies and society. The approach put forward by the Expert Panel was built around three interconnected components: the reduction or redirection of resources causing harm to biodiversity, the generation of additional resources to achieve the three objectives of the Convention, and the enhancement of the effectiveness and efficiency of the resources being used. She said that mainstreaming, which was an important thematic area of work, was an integral approach in all three of the components. Finally, there were also important leadership and collaborative roles for the public, private and finance sectors.

98. With respect to the first component, she said that it was recommended that all government budgets have safeguards so that at least no net harm was caused to biodiversity. The work around incentives remained important, and harmful incentives and subsidies had to be reduced, while at the same time there should be creation and scaling up of incentives to encourage biodiversity-positive behaviour, with tax breaks, and the discouraging of harmful behaviour with fines and other penalties. Action should also be taken to ensure that there was at least no net harm to biodiversity. The finance sector should incorporate biodiversity impacts, dependencies and risks into its work, and the Expert Panel suggested specific roles for central banks, development banks, commercial banks, institutional investors and the insurance sector, as well as governments, in order to achieve that. Similarly, the business sector should integrate biodiversity into its business models, operations and practices, which would require supportive policies and regulatory frameworks from governments.

99. The second component covered important recommended actions for generating additional resources from all sources. Domestic public expenditure continued to play a lead role in providing a sustained flow of resources through direct and indirect expenditure, while international development finance remained crucial for resource mobilization. There was scope to increase both direct and indirect biodiversity-related finance, and there also needed to be an increase in biodiversity-positive projects by businesses and the finance sector, which would also require leadership from governments, development banks and non-governmental organizations, for example through blended finance. Finally, more could be done to enhance the implementation of agreements related to access to genetic resources and the fair and equitable sharing of the benefits arising from their utilization.

100. The third component related to enhancing the effectiveness and efficiency of resource use. That required good governance and planning in the public sector that addressed the drivers of change, the costing of NBSAPs and the development of national biodiversity finance plans, as well as vertical and horizontal coordination within government. Strong platforms and partnerships were required for policy coherence, for shared learning and for the creation of joint approaches. Capacity-building, technical assistance and technological cooperation was also required on a sustained basis, for the public, business and finance sectors. The flow and uptake of international development finance should be improved, through better coordination and through realistic timeframes for projects that sought to achieve transformational change. Finally, the monitoring and reporting processes had to be improved for resource mobilization.

101. In closing, she said that the approach to resource mobilization that had been put forward by the Expert Panel, a core element of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework, was intended to provide a starting point for collectively charting the path forward to create just and transformative change and to build resilient economic systems.

Presentation by the Secretariat

102. A representative of the Secretariat introduced the documents and said that four pre-session documents and two information documents had been made available by the Secretariat: document [CBD/SBI/3/5](#), which provided a draft recommendation with respect to resource mobilization; [CBD/SBI/3/5/Add.1](#), an evaluation and review of the existing strategy for resource mobilization and Aichi Biodiversity Target 20; [CBD/SBI/3/5/Add.2](#), an estimation of the resources needed for implementing the post-2020 framework; and [CBD/SBI/3/5/Add.3](#), the contribution of the Panel of Experts to the draft resource mobilization component. Both the full evaluation ([CBD/SBI/3/INF/2](#)) and supplementary technical information ([CBD/SBI/3/INF/5](#)) had also been provided as information documents.

103. The representative of the Secretariat said that document CBD/SBI/3/5 provided, in section II, more information on the mandate that had been given to the panel of experts and the relevant activities undertaken to implement that mandate, while section III provided information on the relevant activities being undertaken to implement the other elements of decision 14/22 and section IV contained elements of a draft recommendation for the consideration of the Subsidiary Body on Implementation. The results of the work of the expert panel were reflected in section IV and the draft recommendation, as well as in annexes I and II to the draft recommendation. Annex I contained the experts' advice on elements of resource mobilization for possible inclusion directly in the post-2020 global biodiversity framework and in the draft recommendation; it was proposed to invite the Open-ended Working Group to take annex I into consideration. Finally, and in order to provide additional operational guidance, annex II summarized the detailed considerations of the Panel of Experts, contained in document CBD/SBI/3/5/Add.3, into elements of a possible successor to the current strategy for resource mobilization which could be adopted by the fifteenth meeting of the Conference of the Parties.

Statement by Mr. Gustavo Fonseca, Global Environment Facility

104. Mr. Gustavo Fonseca (GEF) said that the 2020 *Living Planet Report* of the World Wildlife Fund had indicated that biodiversity indicators continued to decline, and that the emerging disease of COVID-19 was one very serious symptom of a progressively unhealthy planet. The IPBES Global Assessment had also reported that one million species were now threatened with extinction. Economists were increasingly taking note of the relationship between biodiversity loss and economic growth, and the 2020 *Global Risk Report* of the World Economic Forum had placed the loss of biodiversity among the top five risks to society, to businesses and to the economy. It was increasingly clear what needed to be done to restore the balance between nature and human society. Against that background, GEF, embracing its mandate as the financial mechanism of the Convention, was starting to frame its next set of funding strategies for the negotiation of a successful replenishment of its trust fund for the cycle that would run from July of 2022 to June of 2026. The current cycle, GEF-7, was entering its third year and he noted that the biodiversity focal area had enjoyed the largest financial support to date in that cycle. Those investments had systemically addressed the drivers of biodiversity loss, reflecting the evolution of GEF in supporting integrated solutions to conserve and sustainably use biodiversity while providing benefits across all the Rio conventions. The draft

resource mobilization strategy presented by the panel of experts had identified the importance of increasing official development assistance (ODA), while also recognizing the need for mobilizing more domestic resources to successfully implement the Convention. It had also made clear that the private sector was a key player in that overall effort. That was something that GEF remained committed to supporting through investments in natural capital assessment and accounting, the payment for ecosystem services, debt for nature swaps, blended finance and other innovative financial mechanisms that could be deployed at the national level. To further facilitate that process, and if guidance was specifically directed toward GEF to support such national financial plans to complement the NBSAPs, GEF stood ready to provide support. In December of the present year a draft decision would be put to the GEF Council, which, if adopted, would initiate the process for the GEF replenishment. He encouraged all Parties to work together to support a robust replenishment for GEF-8, as that would be critical for the successful implementation of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework once agreed at the fifteenth meeting of the Conference of the Parties. It would also be essential to improve the health of the planet and to contribute to the green recovery efforts that were needed following the ongoing COVID-19 pandemic.

Statements of regional groups and Parties

Argentina on behalf of the Latin America and Caribbean Group

105. The representative of Argentina, speaking on behalf of the Latin America and Caribbean Group, said that the world was currently dealing with a health, economic and social crisis that would have severe consequences for the implementation of environmental policies. That unprecedented situation was already affecting capacities and resources and called for urgent action to address the three objectives of the Convention in a balanced manner. In Latin America and the Caribbean, the majority of the resources for biodiversity conservation had traditionally been provided by national governments, but that contribution, which was a great effort during normal times, would become more difficult in the face of the economic and social challenges of recovering from the COVID-19 pandemic. Therefore, his group highlighted that now more than ever, a decisive multilateral response was required that recognized the vast financial needs both for a sustainable recovery from the pandemic and for implementing the post-2020 global biodiversity framework. That response should include ambitious commitments regarding resources, tools and technologies for implementation and consider the principles enshrined in the Rio de Janeiro Declaration on Environment and Development, adopted in 1992. Those commitments should be an integral part of the new framework. The current pandemic had increased the burden on developing countries and national recovery packages, which on their own would not be enough to bend the curve of biodiversity loss. His group therefore welcomed the results and recommendations of the study on resource mobilization, and looked forward to a realistic and reliable global financial commitment from countries and international donors to provide new, additional and effective resources and to establish enabling tools and instruments to meet the incremental costs and technical needs of implementing the framework in developing countries, in line with Article 20 of the Convention, and with developed countries taking the lead. It was hoped that GEF-8 would incorporate all the guidelines of the post-2020 framework, and that in particular it would consider the investments that were required to meet the economic, social and environmental challenges to build back better in the post COVID-19 period. Despite the efforts made to halt the loss of biodiversity, scientific data showed that the results were not encouraging enough and there was need for enhanced action. Considering that resource mobilization also required increasing private investment mechanisms, there was an opportunity for leveraging international platforms that boosted cooperation and provided innovative solutions, as well as for raising awareness and capacities and for increasing the understanding of biodiversity among different sectors. In that regard, his group called for extraordinary steps in order to achieve better outcomes, and urged all Parties reach an agreement on that matter, taking into consideration the different national circumstances and the limitations imposed by the pandemic.

European Union, also on behalf of its member States

106. The representative of the European Union (speaking also on behalf of its member States) reiterated the need for transformative change, which would not happen without mobilizing all types of resources from all sources in a balanced way and as part of a broader agenda to make economic and development policies greener and sustainable. The European Union and its member States agreed with the expert panel that

resource mobilization encompassed both the generation of new resources and the reduction of resource needs, through reform of harmful subsidies and through biodiversity-friendly solutions. It also required maximizing the impact of resource utilization, through an efficient and effective use of resources, and effectively mainstreaming biodiversity in all sectors, including the finance sector, and creating a more enabling environment through appropriate regulations and use of financial, economic and sectoral instruments. Synergies between the financing of biodiversity and the financing of other sectors, in particular of climate, had to be maximized by equally considering biodiversity objectives and other environmental objectives. Such an approach would be crucial to align public and private financial flows with biodiversity objectives as a way of scaling up resource mobilization, and better meeting the needs of nature and people as part of truly transformative change. In that regard, the principles of the Addis Ababa Action Agenda also had to be considered. That would help to build back better, address the root causes of pandemics of zoonotic origin, and achieve a green economic recovery from the COVID-19 crisis that was aligned with environmental, in particular biodiversity, and climate objectives. That would also support commitment to the Sustainable Development Goals. With respect to the next steps in the process, it was asked whether the Expert Panel proposed to establish a nationally determined target for domestic resource mobilization. Domestic resource mobilization was broad in scope and entailed different elements, such as fiscal reform, subsidies and other incentives, and involved the private sector and other actors in society. It was asked what criteria could serve as a common benchmark to define such targets and whether the Expert Panel could explain what was meant by “country-to-country access and benefit-sharing agreements”. Synergies between the financing of biodiversity and other financing, such as for climate, were possible solutions to generate more resources, and it was asked what the best reporting and monitoring processes would be to avoid overlap and duplication. It was also asked whether the discussion of monitoring elements and indicators regarding resource mobilization would take place in the meetings of the Subsidiary Body on Scientific, Technical and Technological Advice or of the Subsidiary Body on Implementation or in both.

South Africa on behalf of the African Group

107. The representative of South Africa, speaking on behalf of the African Group, took note of the outcomes of the report from the panel and said that Africa considered resource mobilization an integral part of the implementation of the Convention and critical to ensuring that the 2030 goals and targets were met. In considering the three reports presented, it was worth noting that the elements of the terms of reference for the Expert Panel had at paragraph 15 (e) required the panel “To explore options and approaches for mobilizing and providing additional resources from all sources”. In that regard, and in order to achieve transformative change and post-2020 global biodiversity framework, the African Group proposed the establishment of a dedicated biodiversity fund to support the effective implementation of the global biodiversity framework. That suggestion had been raised and supported by many Parties during discussions at the second meeting of the Open-ended Working Group as a critical issue to be addressed by the Expert Panel. Examples on such dedicated funds could be drawn from the Land Degradation Neutrality Fund of the United Nations Convention to Combat Desertification, and the Green Climate Fund that supported the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC), in addition to GEF. The proposal for a biodiversity fund could be explored as one of the options and approaches for mobilizing and providing additional resources from all sources. Article 20 of the Convention was central in meeting the Convention’s three objectives: the conservation of biodiversity, the sustainable use of its components, and the fair and equitable sharing of the benefits arising out of the utilization of genetic resources. It was worth noting that the assessment performed was weighted to providing scenarios to support conservation efforts, but the other two elements, sustainable use and benefit-sharing, needed equal treatment to achieve the Sustainable Development Goals. The recommendations provided in the report put most of the obligation on governments to redirect funds to finance the implementation of the framework. That must be understood in the context of the current COVID-19 pandemic, which had forced most developing country governments to redirect their resources to respond to it, which had increased the burden on health systems and affected food security, jobs and had negatively affected the economies of developing countries. In closing, he said that the absence of a time-bound action plan for resource mobilization would have negative impacts on the implementation of the global biodiversity framework.

Switzerland, also on behalf of Australia, Canada, Iceland, Israel, Monaco, and New Zealand

108. Switzerland made a statement on behalf of the following countries: Australia, Canada, Iceland, Israel, Monaco, New Zealand and Switzerland. The three reports had been read with great interest and appreciation for the high level of detail, expertise and fact-based assessments. Resource mobilization was key for the implementation of the goals of the Convention and its Protocols, and the three reports clearly showed that much had already been done, although there was still work to do. It was clear that all Parties would need to work collectively to significantly increase the mobilization of resources from public and private sources, and that a wide variety of channels and financial instruments were required to address the various demands, and to work effectively and efficiently. Much could be learned from the Biodiversity Finance Initiative (BIOFIN) of the United Nations Development Programme, as well as from countries' experiences with the implementation of concrete financial plans. The Panel of Experts had also shown that incentives harmful for biodiversity would need to be significantly reduced. Today, a significantly higher amount of public finances was spent on activities that were harmful for biodiversity than for the implementation of the Aichi Biodiversity Targets. That had to change, with work across governments and the private sector to ensure policy coherence and to reduce biodiversity harmful incentives in a stepwise approach. As highlighted by the Panel of Experts, increased engagement and collaboration with the private sector, and in particular the financial sector, would be essential for the successful implementation of the Convention and its Protocols. In the context of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework, it was important to aim high and be inspired by studying the interesting work of the financial sector which had been triggered by the entry into force of the Paris Agreement. Ultimately, the aim should be to collectively make financial flows consistent with a pathway towards a biodiversity net-positive development that ensured the increased resilience of nature and people. There was a need to increase the effectiveness and efficiency of interventions, and Parties would have to collectively assess how much further the effectiveness and efficiency of actions, both domestically and internationally, could be increased to ensure that the highest possible positive impact on the ground was generated and implemented through a wide partnership in a fully transparent and accountable manner.

China

109. The representative of China thanked the three experts for their presentations and asked two questions. She said that at the Rome meeting of the Open-ended Working Group she had noticed that a number of countries had indicated that an increase of "x" per cent in the funding could not be determined until the work was completed, and she asked what basic element had to be taken into consideration by them to determine that number. She also observed that a new resource mobilization strategy was required which mobilized all channels of financing, and asked what was required for the resource mobilization targets of all those different channels in order to set up the long-term mechanism for evaluating the effective use of the resources and how that would be done in the new strategy.

Response of the Panel of Experts

110. Ms. Cumming replied to the three questions of the European Union and clarified that by domestic resources the panel specifically meant resource flows, from both domestic and international sources, and not fiscal policies, as those should be dealt with separately. She said that the focus should not be on wildly increasing funding but rather on generating funding flows that met needs and were commensurate with ambitions. That also was an answer to China's first question about what number should be used to replace the "x" that had been used as a placeholder in the document. "X" had been used because the targets had not yet been set and consequently the amount to be set for funding flows was unknown. That could not be determined until the Parties had committed to all the other required activities. In addition to that, however, was the fact that if the negative impact on biodiversity was reduced then the actual funding flows needed to improve biodiversity would be reduced as well. Eliminating perverse subsidies would reduce the amount that needed to be spent on restoring biodiversity. She also said that the question also mentioned targets for fiscal incentive and subsidies and said that the Expert Panel had taken a different approach to the issue and had considered that the target was more likely to be for inputs rather than for outcomes. She said that the work that could be done involved legislative change; changing policies so that they intended positive biodiversity outcomes might be the only thing that could actually be measured in multiple countries.

111. With respect to the second question from the European Union regarding country-to-country access and benefit-sharing agreements, she said that the suggestion had been put forward as a possible approach that might help generate additional resources from biodiversity. The language of country-to-country was used to keep that suggestion as open as possible so as to not just focus on business-to-business or business-to-country arrangements. While the Panel suggested that it might be something worth exploring further by Parties in conjunction with the Secretariat of the Convention, it had not examined the issue in detail.

112. Finally, with respect to the question related to synergies between financing for biodiversity and other financing, such as climate financing, and a possible approach for reporting and monitoring, she said that there was real value in the commitment of a fixed percentage for climate funding to be allocated to nature-based solutions. Commitments like that could then be monitored and reported on. She also said that there should be strong synergies and collaboration between GEF and the Green Climate Fund, and that there should be a clear and transparent process for biodiversity tagging in other funding flows, which was something that all countries could use and agree upon.

Response of the Secretariat

113. The representative of the Secretariat explained that the resource indicators were now included in the draft monitoring framework and that the Subsidiary Body on Scientific, Technical and Technological Advice had the overall responsibility to develop a comprehensive and coherent monitoring framework addressing all the goals and targets. From that perspective it would be useful if that overall responsibility would be kept intact and also included indicators on resource mobilization. However, it also needed to be recognized that the resource mobilization community that assembled in the contact group on the financial mechanism, and on resource mobilization, had specific expertise, and from that perspective it could also be foreseen, as the Convention moved forward, that there would be some form of iterative process where some issues, as the need arose, or as they were identified by the Subsidiary Body on Scientific, Technical and Technological Advice, could be taken up in more depth in the contact group, either at the meeting of the Subsidiary Body on Implementation or at the meeting of the Conference of the Parties. He said that this assumed that there would be a contact group in the future, but based on past experience he considered that would be very likely to happen.

Summation by the Chair

114. The Chair said that there was no more time for questions at the session, and that any further questions should be submitted in writing and would then be answered after the session in writing.⁷

ITEM 4. CLOSURE OF THE SPECIAL SESSION

115. After the customary exchange of courtesies, the special virtual session of the Subsidiary Body on Implementation was closed at 9.10 a.m. on Thursday, 17 September 2020.

⁷ See <https://www.cbd.int/conferences/sbstta24-sbi3-prep/sbstta-sbi-ss-01/documents>.

III. REPORT ON THE JOINT SPECIAL SESSION OF THE SUBSIDIARY BODY ON SCIENTIFIC, TECHNICAL AND TECHNOLOGICAL ADVICE AND THE SUBSIDIARY BODY ON IMPLEMENTATION

ITEM 1. OPENING OF THE SPECIAL SESSION

116. The joint special session of the Subsidiary Body on Scientific, Technical and Technological Advice and the Subsidiary Body on Implementation was opened at 7 a.m. on Friday, 18 September 2020, by Mr. Hamdallah Zedan, who said that, as the representative of the current President of the Conference of the Parties, it was an honour to welcome the participants to the joint special session on the presentation of the updated draft of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework. He thanked the Co-Chairs of the Open-ended Working Group on the Post-2020 Global Biodiversity Framework (Open-ended Working Group) for their leadership and hard work in bringing together the myriad views and perspectives into a useful, accessible recently updated “zero draft”.⁸ That updated draft framework was the product of a collective, worldwide effort of all 196 Parties to the Convention, along with businesses, multilateral development banks, indigenous peoples and local communities, youth, non-governmental organizations, local governments and women acting together towards a common goal. He said that as students he was sure that the participants had been assigned to “group projects” and that they perhaps now owed their teachers a debt of gratitude for those tasks. In many ways, they had been preparing them for a much larger, and more urgent, global group project. They had learned to work together then, and in many ways they were still learning now. He was certain that they would come together in the days ahead, either face-to-face, screen-to-screen or a combination of both, to develop an effective, ambitious post-2020 global biodiversity framework.

117. Following the opening of the session, Mr. Zedan asked the Chair of the Subsidiary Body on Scientific, Technical and Technological Advice, Mr. Hesiquio Benítez Díaz (Mexico), and the Chair of the Subsidiary Body on Implementation, Ms. Charlotta Sörqvist (Sweden), to chair the joint session.

118. The Chair of the Subsidiary Body on Implementation thanked Mr. Zedan for opening the session, and said that she and the Chair of the Subsidiary Body on Scientific, Technical and Technological Advice would take regional statements, some statements from Parties, and then those of major groups. Parties speaking on behalf of their regions should submit their statements in writing, clearly indicating which Party would deliver the statement.

119. Opening statements were made by Ms. Elizabeth Maruma Mrema, Executive Secretary of the Convention on Biological Diversity, and Mr. Carlos Manuel Rodriguez, the new Chief Executive Officer and Chair of the Global Environment Facility.

120. The Executive Secretary welcomed the participants to the joint special session, and thanked the Government of Egypt, as the Presidency of the fourteenth meeting of the Conference of the Parties, for opening the session. She said that while coming together to discuss progress toward a new global pact to protect biodiversity, the participants were at the same time living through one of the most extraordinary threats to global health in modern memory. Those two crises were closely interlinked, but while the COVID-19 pandemic might have disrupted the daily order of the world, it would not disrupt the efforts of the international community to protect and conserve biodiversity and to put an end to the destruction of ecosystems. The recently “updated zero draft” framework marked the next critical step on the road to the fifteenth meeting of the Conference of the Parties. Based on the discussions at the second session of the Open-ended Working Group, as well as additional submissions, the Co-Chairs had now produced an updated draft which provided context for the next phase of the process in the Subsidiary Body on Implementation and the Subsidiary Body on Scientific, Technical and Technological Advice. They would explain the post-2020 global biodiversity framework process and present the updated zero draft. She was confident that the participants in the joint special session would learn more about the latest developments and also provide their valuable insights which would help in the ongoing negotiation processes.

121. She also said that the joint special session was fortunate to have Mr. Carlos Manuel Rodriguez, the new Chief Executive Officer and Chair of the Global Environment Facility (GEF), as a participant. GEF

⁸ [CBD/POST2020/PREP/2/1](#), “Update of the zero draft of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework”, dated 17 August 2020.

was the financial mechanism of the Convention, and its support was vital for meeting any agreements reached during the fifteenth meeting of the Conference of the Parties. She thanked him for participating in the discussion of the future of biodiversity and for being part of the journey that they were on together. The future of our world and its resources, its continued abundance for future generations, depended on the determination to act now and she looked forward to hearing the inputs of the participants on that important topic.

122. Mr. Carlos Manuel Rodriguez said that as the new Chief Executive Officer and Chair of the Global Environment Facility he had been reading many reports, among which were the report of the Expert Panel on resource mobilization of the Convention on Biological Diversity and the fifth edition of the *Global Biodiversity Outlook*. He said that in the context of all that information, and at the present critical juncture, the global biodiversity framework was the most important road map for nature and the global environment. He had been working with many of the participants to discuss and develop it and increase its level of ambition. The Parties, and the other participants, had both a great opportunity and a responsibility to develop a strong agreement for the post-2020 global biodiversity framework and to reach consensus on it at the fifteenth meeting of the Conference of the Parties. Having been part of the negotiations, and a strong supporter of the Convention on Biological Diversity, he recognized the enormity of task that lay ahead, but he was confident that it would be achieved. While he knew that the negotiations to agree on the raised level of ambition to achieve such a framework would be challenging, it would not come as a surprise that he strongly believed that the issue of resource mobilization had to be adequately addressed if that higher level of ambition was to be realized. After reading the fifth edition of the *Global Biodiversity Outlook*, he had come to the conclusion that one of the clear challenges was effective resource mobilization, for which there were four key elements that he hoped the negotiators would keep in mind. Those were the need for an increase in aid for biodiversity conservation; a more effective and efficient raising of domestic resources at the national level; a serious effort to address perverse incentives and perverse investments from the financial sector, which would dramatically decrease the need for new domestic funding; and finally, the creation of a robust, reliable, strong and solid financial reporting and tracking mechanism. As the Chief Executive Officer of GEF, which served as the financial mechanism of the Convention, he was committed to doing his utmost to support the Parties in their efforts to implement the agreements and actions agreed under the Convention. The post-2020 global biodiversity framework, together with the Paris Agreement, would be the central foundation for the programming strategy of GEF for its next phase. In closing, he reaffirmed his support for Convention on Biological Diversity and he looked forward to strengthening his ties with the Secretariat and the Parties in supporting the implementation of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework.

ITEM 2. PRESENTATION OF THE UPDATED DRAFT OF THE POST-2020 GLOBAL BIODIVERSITY FRAMEWORK

123. The Chair of the Subsidiary Body on Scientific, Technical and Technological Advice then invited the Co-Chairs of the Open-ended Working Group on the Post-2020 Global Biodiversity Framework, Mr. Francis Ogwal (Uganda) and Mr. Basile van Havre (Canada), to provide the joint special session with an update on the process for developing the post-2020 global biodiversity framework and the updated zero draft of the text.⁹

Presentations by the Co-Chairs of the Working Group

124. Mr. Ogwal reported on the planning process for the development of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework, the planning assumptions that had been made, and the roles of the subsidiary bodies of the Convention and the Open-ended Working Group in that process. He also explained the key recommendations of the second meeting of the Open-ended Working Group, as well as the updated zero draft, and the additional elements the Co-Chairs would consider for the revised draft (Draft 1.0) that would eventually be presented to the fifteenth meeting of the Conference of the Parties next year in

⁹ The presentation of the Co-Chairs is available at <https://www.cbd.int/conferences/sbstta24-sbi3-prep/sbstta-sbi-ss-01/documents>.

Kunming, China. It was the recommendation of the Open-ended Working Group that the Subsidiary Body on Scientific, Technical and Technological Advice should provide scientific advice and the Subsidiary Body on Implementation advice on implementation, including on resource mobilization, capacity development, enabling conditions, knowledge management and outreach. It would be the exclusive role of the Open-ended Working Group to negotiate the goals and targets of draft 1.0, which would be prepared in advance of its third meeting.

125. That draft would reflect the outcomes of the first two meetings of the Open-ended Working Group, the Working Group on Article 8(j) of the Convention and related provisions, the twenty-third and twenty-fourth meetings of the Subsidiary Body on Scientific, Technical and Technological Advice, and the third meeting of the Subsidiary Body on Implementation, as well as any written submissions received up to 24 February 2020 and any thematic consultations that had also taken place. He then presented a flow chart that illustrated the process, which included a new element, digital sequence information, which would be considered by the Open-ended Working Group at its third meeting.

126. The zero draft¹⁰ had been updated to respond to the discussions at the second meeting of the Open-ended Working Group, which had recommended that the first three goals should be combined, the fourth goal shortened, a new goal added on the means of implementation, and milestones added to each of the goals. In those discussions it had become clear that there was also a desire for a species-focused target, and so one had been added. Sections E to H had been redrafted as sections F to I, and milestones had been included to show whether there had been any progress at all and to evaluate whether the action targets were the right tools to meet the 2050 Vision of “Living in harmony with nature”. Consequently, in the updated zero draft, the new goal A consolidated the previous goals A to C and had two milestones for 2030; the previous goal D had been simplified as the new goal B, which also had two milestones for 2030; while the previous goal E had been simplified as the new goal C, with a milestone that reflected the previous title of the goal; and a new goal D had been added with two milestones for 2030.

127. Mr. Basile van Havre then explained the main changes to the revised targets in the updated zero draft. He said, with respect to section E (a), *reducing threats*, that target 1 had the same elements but they had been reordered to make them clearer, while in target 2 the reference to the strict protection of some land and sea areas had been removed following discussions at the second meeting of the Open-ended Working Group, which had also led to the inclusion of the new target 3. Targets 4 and 5 were similar to the previous text, while in target 6 provision had been made to list the percentages for the reduction of the different pollutants that had been previously mentioned in the target. For target 7 the main change had been the removal of a numerical specification of the mitigation effort required to achieve the Paris Agreement.

128. With respect to section E (b), *meeting people’s needs*, he said that target 8 had been redrafted to focus firmly on species, while target 9 now included aquaculture and forestry. After going back to the IPBES reports, target 10 had been redrafted to include all ecosystem services that were not otherwise addressed. Target 11 was based on the previous language with a slightly broader interpretation being given to it, while target 12 essentially recapitulated the previous version of the text.

129. With respect to section E (c), *tools and solutions*, he said that the new target 15 was a merger of the previous targets 17 and 18, while target 16 was a recapitulation of the previous text. He also reviewed section F of the framework, *implementation support mechanisms*, which was relatively new and addressed the mobilization of sufficient resources; capacity development; knowledge generation, management and sharing; and technical and scientific cooperation, technology transfer and innovation. He listed the elements under each category and noted that the phrase capacity development had been used in place of capacity-building to better reflect what was needed.

130. He drew the attention of the participants to the elements contained in section G, *enabling conditions*, and noted that the participation of indigenous peoples and local communities was a key factor, especially with respect to protected and conserved areas. Gender and intergenerational equity were also important, as were synergies with relevant international processes, and partnerships to leverage sustainable

¹⁰ An earlier version of the zero draft, dated 6 January 2020, had been made available as [CBD/WG2020/2/3](#).

activities. Governance, the mainstreaming of biodiversity, the engagement of the private sector, and political will were all needed to halt the loss of biodiversity, as was considering and recognizing, where appropriate, the rights of nature.

131. Finally, he said that elements contained in section H, *responsibility and transparency*, were important for the successful implementation of the framework, which was dependent on a comprehensive system of planning, reporting and review. The framework would be integrated into other processes, where appropriate, and would be complemented by the systems of non-State actors. There were three elements to the system: planning, through national strategies and action plans, indicators and planning documents; reporting through national and global reports and stocktaking, with a reporting schedule and global assessments; and review through global analysis, open-ended forums and voluntary in-depth peer reviews.

132. The Chair of the Subsidiary Body on Implementation said that the Subsidiary Body at its third meeting would discuss seven agenda items related to the post-2020 process, and in particular she stressed three of them: agenda item 6, on resource mobilization and the financial mechanism; agenda item 7, on capacity-building, technical and scientific cooperation, technology transfer, knowledge management, and communication; and agenda item 9, on mechanisms for reporting, assessment and review of implementation. She said that it was her hope that the deliberations at that meeting would contribute to the development of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework, as prepared by the Open-ended Working Group, and that the outcome of the third meeting of the Subsidiary Body on Implementation would complement it with elements related to means to support and review implementation.

133. The Chair of the Subsidiary Body on Scientific, Technical and Technological Advice said that the Subsidiary Body would discuss several elements that would contribute directly to the development of the framework and were related to the post-2020 processes, and in particular the monitoring framework which would allow the charting of progress toward the 2050 vision through the assessment of delivery on the 2030 targets. In particular, the monitoring framework would include elements such as the components of all goals and targets, specific monitoring elements to allow the assessment of progress towards all components, a system of indicators, and the approach to baselines. The Subsidiary Body was working on that document to equip the Co-Chairs of the Open-ended Working Group with the necessary information for the discussions at the third meeting of the Working Group. The role of the Subsidiary Body was to ensure that the post-2020 global biodiversity framework was based on the best available science and knowledge and to support an approach that will allow for transformative change.

Statements of regional groups, Parties and major groupings of civil society organizations

European Union and its member States

134. The representative of the European Union and its member States expressed the condolences of the European Union to the victims of the COVID-19 pandemic and its economic and social consequences. The post-2020 global biodiversity framework had to bring the transformational change needed to turn the 2050 Vision of “Living in harmony with nature” into reality, and 2030 would be the crucial milestone for that. Everyone had to step up their actions and rally behind the framework. In light of the COVID-19 pandemic, the framework also had to contribute to reducing the risk of the transmission of disease and further pandemics and support a nature-positive economic and social recovery. The updated zero draft was an important step forward which addressed the three objectives of the Convention, as well as the Cartagena and Nagoya Protocols. The ambition of the new global biodiversity framework should be equal to or higher than that of the Aichi Biodiversity Targets of the current Strategic Plan, and so it was of concern that various updated targets were less ambitious than they originally had been. SMART targets were called for when feasible. Many issues crucial to achieving the goals and targets were now reflected in the monitoring elements; instead, they needed to become fully a part of the framework. The conservation of marine and urban biodiversity and genetic diversity were still not adequately represented, and while there had been an attempt at addressing access and benefit-sharing, further work on the related goals, targets and indicators was still needed. Ambition had to go hand in hand with strong implementation, and the new language in the updated zero draft on means of implementation and strengthened mechanisms for planning, monitoring and review, including the ratchet up mechanism, was welcome. NBSAPs were the main instrument for

implementation. A broad approach to resource mobilization, including reducing or redirecting resources causing harm to biodiversity was commended, as was the generation of additional resources. However, those parts of the framework needed to be further elaborated. Transformative change could only be achieved through the participation of, and partnerships with, other stakeholders, and efforts made for their full and effective participation, in particular that of indigenous peoples and local communities, civil society, women and youth, academia and businesses, were to be welcomed. The European Union and its member States believed that a new approach was needed with the strong engagement of all actors and sectors to reach the 2050 Vision. Biodiversity mainstreaming should therefore be integrated explicitly throughout the framework, including its goals and targets. The linkage of the goals and targets to the Sustainable Development Goals was welcome, and a strong global biodiversity framework was indispensable for achieving the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development, as were strengthened linkages between the global biodiversity framework and other relevant multilateral environmental agreements. Cooperation and synergies between the Convention and other international organizations would be crucial for implementing the framework and they should remain closely involved in the preparatory process.

Antigua and Barbuda on behalf of Latin America and the Caribbean

135. The representative of Antigua and Barbuda made a statement on behalf of Latin America and the Caribbean (GRULAC). She thanked the Co-Chairs of the Working Group for their continuous effort to update this living document. Sustainable use and benefit-sharing of genetic resources had to have an equally important role in the framework, and a number of challenges had to be considered for achieving the 2050 Vision, including the need to support the development of capacities and financial, human, institutional and technical resources at the national and global levels. She explained that GRULAC continued to be strongly committed to the development of the post-2020 framework. The region remained ready to continue building a transparent, fair and equitable environment for participation in the following stages of the process.

136. She reiterated that the framework was an ambitious initiative that would only be achieved if the opinions of all Parties were carefully and effectively reflected. Thus, an equal representation of the views and perspectives of all regions had to be ensured. The post-2020 framework should also be streamlined as appropriate, so it could be fully embraced by all relevant stakeholders, including indigenous peoples and local communities, women, youth and children, subnational governments, the private sector, and citizens. GRULAC believed that it was particularly important to consider the intergenerational equity, One Health and a gender approach in this process, and that the vision of indigenous peoples and local communities also be incorporated.

137. There was also a need to deepen and systematize the work being developed for mainstreaming biodiversity in the planning and management of productive sectors, and to increase efforts for intersectoral coordination as indicated in Article 6 of the Convention. It was essential to strengthen strategic communication, education and awareness on biodiversity at the local, national, regional and global levels, as tools to foster transformation to live in harmony with nature.

138. She reminded all participants that there was no such thing as half ambition, and that there was a need for a strong global framework to conserve and sustainably use biodiversity along with a real commitment to provide and mobilize resources to implement the framework. Resource mobilization had to be an integral part of the framework.

139. GRULAC recognized the relevance of the monitoring framework. However, the proposal presented for peer review was not realistic. Parties would not have the capacity to implement the whole set of indicators, and a capacity-building plan would be needed to support the knowledge and technology required to implement these indicators. The monitoring, implementation and review mechanism would need to remain flexible to include relevant national indicators to reflect the realities of each country. She therefore recommended focusing on a methodology to choose headline indicators.

South Africa on behalf of the African Group

140. The representative of Uganda read out the statement by South Africa on behalf of the African Group, which commended the Co-Chairs of the Open-ended Working Group and the Secretariat of the

Convention on the progress made to date. Africa was of the view that for the post-2020 global biodiversity framework, consideration should be given to developing global targets which could be disaggregated and adapted to and be actionable at the regional, national or subnational scales. In that regard, Africa noted that some of the indicators were still not SMART and continue to present challenges to countries during implementation. Equally, when developing indicators for the targets, consideration should be given to the feasibility of their use at multiple scales, particularly in the context of any strengthened accountability mechanism being considered for the implementation of the framework. Some of the revised goals and targets, especially those that were important for Africa, had lost key elements such as access and benefit-sharing, which was not fully incorporated in the revised goals and targets, or their associated indicators. The three objectives of the Convention were mutually supportive and the issue of access and benefit-sharing should be given equal treatment, which required that fair and equitable sharing of the benefits arising out of the utilization of genetic resources needed to be reflected on and fully considered under the goals and the associated elements for the indicators. Africa was ready to deliberate further on those goals and targets in order for the Parties to agree on quantifiable goals and targets, without compromising their key elements. The post-2020 global biodiversity framework process was also an ideal platform for Parties to agree on innovative solutions for ensuring fair and equitable sharing of the benefits derived from open access to digital sequence information for commercialization, in addition to globally recognized non-monetary benefits, which needed to be increased and made available through enhanced capacity-building and technology transfer.

141. Sustainable use was not meant to prevent use but to ensure that the livelihoods of the poor and vulnerable, who are more dependent on the use of biological resources and ecosystem services, could be safeguarded through the sustainable use of those natural resources. There was a need to present the targets and indicators in a way that recognized that use could not be eliminated, but rather managed sustainably. Target 8 focused on sustainable management but should also focus on sustainable use, for management was but a process of ensuring that people could benefit from actual use. One element that should be included in target 8 was poverty alleviation. Most poor and vulnerable groups depended on biodiversity and ecosystem services as a way of alleviating their poverty. Sustainable customary use had not been covered and could be added as it was a useful component in Africa's traditional societies that brought about conservation results. Protected area systems were vital as a refuge for wildlife and for wildlife corridors, as well for climate change mitigation, tourism, and employment. Protected areas should help to address poverty issues for communities adjacent to them, and Africa supported the inclusion of other effective area-based conservation measures to complement protected areas to help address the post-2020 conservation target.

142. Restoration was important for Africa, but spatial planning was critical for effective restoration activities and the framework tended to introduce new concepts that might put at risk the negotiation process. While the issue of baselines had not yet been substantively discussed in the context of the development of the framework, various options and considerations had been expressed, and there were certain targets, such as the one that supported restoration efforts and benefit-sharing and sustainable use, that would require careful consideration of their baselines. Africa welcomed the inclusion of the means of implementation as one of the goals of the framework which would ensure the availability of commensurate resources aligned with the level of ambition in the post-2020 global biodiversity framework. Therefore, consideration of resource mobilization targets and their monitoring elements should take into account the conclusions of the first report of the Panel of Experts, which had reviewed and evaluated the strategy for resource mobilization and had concluded that the effectiveness of the strategy for resource mobilization was limited and that the resource mobilization component of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework would need to be more efficient and effective to bridge the current gap between the resource needs and the resources available. Building on the strategy for resource mobilization for the Aichi Biodiversity Targets, a target-based strategy for resource mobilization needed to be developed that took into account the roles and responsibilities included in Article 20 of the Convention. The strategy should set targets for international flows, domestic financing, and private sector contributions and recommend policy responses by Parties to achieve the resource mobilization targets.

New Zealand on behalf of Australia, Canada, Iceland, Monaco, New Zealand, Norway and Switzerland

143. The representative of New Zealand made a statement on behalf of the following countries within the JUSCANZ group: Australia, Canada, Iceland, Monaco, New Zealand, Norway and Switzerland. She said that with the launch of the fifth edition of the *Global Biodiversity Outlook*, the stark reality of the task ahead of the global community had been made clear and that just days later the course for the next decade and beyond was being considered. That course had started at the fifteenth meeting of the Conference of the Parties in Sharm El-Sheikh, and even earlier when it had become clear that the Aichi Targets were not going to be met. It had been collectively agreed that ambition and transformation were needed and that the task before the joint session was to define that ambition. But in the midst of that already challenging task there was an additional challenge: COVID-19. All would agree the process was not as advanced as it should be due to COVID-19. Thus, she particularly welcomed the virtual sessions that had been organized during the present week as part of the meetings of the subsidiary bodies. While there had been teething problems, it had been an excellent opportunity to test processes and demonstrate progress and explore other ways to make progress before the next and final meeting of the Open-ended Working Group. The additional time should be used to advance that work. Accordingly, her group would support proposals for additional virtual discussions and exchanges, provided those were inclusive and drove progress. To complement the good work under way via the formal process, she encouraged Parties to join in looking for more options for informal, Party-led small group discussions on key post-2020 issues.

Georgia speaking on behalf of the Central and Eastern European region

144. The representative of Georgia, speaking on behalf of the Central and Eastern European region (CEE), said that her group considered enhanced communication and cooperation as an important prerequisite for the development of an effective and successful framework. Numerous reports had highlighted the unprecedented loss of biodiversity, and the fifth edition of the *Global Biodiversity Outlook* had shown that collectively the Parties had failed to achieve the 2020 targets. Despite those findings, national efforts to achieve national goals had been in line with the global Strategic Plan, and it was clear that it had been insufficient to address the unprecedented challenges. That was an important warning that stronger and urgent joint action was needed to address the extinction crisis. She emphasized the importance of efforts at the subregional level for implementation of commitments under the Convention, and the new model of cooperation within the regional Biodiversity Task Force of South East Europe, a part of the CEE region, for strategic planning of the conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity. She highlighted the importance of capacity-building and resource mobilization to ensure implementation of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework and the achievement of the post-2020 goals, and had been pleased to hear about the work of the resource mobilization panel. While stressing the importance of increased funding for biodiversity from all sources, at the same time she acknowledged that it was crucial to also make efficient use of existing resources and have effective measures to avoid future expenditures. The preparation of the Green Agenda for the Western Balkans, as a part of the CEE within the Green Deal of the European Union, represented a unique opportunity for developing a robust investment plan for the region centred on the creation of inclusive instruments for cooperation for biodiversity, clean energy and green economic recovery. It was clear that the monitoring framework was a major step towards green progress in the conservation, restoration and sustainable use of biodiversity. However, she also acknowledged that some countries might not be able to monitor the new goals quickly and efficiently. Therefore, in addition to the full list of indicators, it could be necessary to also define how such countries would report on their progress towards the new objectives. For the global biodiversity framework to be successful, a much stronger implementation, monitoring and review process was needed but it must also ensure that all Parties were able to follow it. Finally, considering that the post-2020 global biodiversity framework was supposed to become an overarching framework, the involvement of other biodiversity-related and other multilateral environment agreements should be considerably increased, and she asked what plans there were for that.

Bhutan

145. The representative of Bhutan said that she understood the goal of having Parties increase the protected areas, or species or ecosystems, but asked about the situation of countries that had already made ambitious commitments and faced challenges in maintaining those commitments. She gave the example of

Bhutan, which already had more than 50 per cent of its area as protected and was committed by its constitution to maintain 60 per cent forest cover at all times. How would the new goals apply to countries that had already been ambitious when maintaining the current commitment also required a lot of resources and capacity? The goals and targets in the global biodiversity framework should have ways to accommodate countries with already high ambitions and support them to maintain what they had already achieved. She also said that the least developed and developing countries should be given additional assistance to understand and manoeuvre through the preparations for the framework for an efficient and equitable negotiation of the process.

Brazil

146. The representative of Brazil expressed his thanks to the Secretariat for organizing the joint session in these exceptional times and said that it was important to build on that momentum and continue with informal discussions on the major priorities of the global biodiversity framework, with a special emphasis on resource mobilization. The current pandemic had widened the already huge discrepancies in financial capabilities between developed and developing countries. Transformative change would only take place with countries working collectively together based on their common but differentiated responsibilities. That implied not only the provision of adequate resources to developing countries, but also the definition of fair baselines. In that regard, he applauded the decision of Spain and Portugal to recognize the importance of the principle of common but differentiated responsibilities. As the report of the Expert Panel on resource mobilization demonstrated, the private sector needed to step up their contributions, although the main predictable source of resource mobilization would remain the contributions of developed countries. Innovative financial mechanisms were needed to support local communities, such as through the payment for ecosystem services. That mechanism, which had already been recognized in decisions of the Convention, could be a cost-effective solution to meet the challenges and had the advantage of supporting local communities. However, resource mobilization should not give prominence to conservation and restoration projects at the expense of the other two pillars of the Convention. All three objectives of the Convention had to be clearly reflected in the new framework and receive financial resources in a balanced way. To achieve long-lasting solutions to halt biodiversity loss, sustainable use and benefit-sharing arrangements with countries of origin of genetic resources should be included in the post-2020 agenda. In parallel with resource mobilization, there had to be an appropriate set of indicators to ensure the measurability of achievements, and as national reporting often proved burdensome to many developing countries, it was also essential to identify those indicators that were easily available to all Parties.

Islamic Republic of Iran

147. The representative of the Islamic Republic of Iran said that the Convention was a covenant between nations acknowledging the role of technology, including biotechnology, for conservation and the sustainable use of biological diversity. In Article 16 of the Convention, the contracting Parties were called upon to provide or facilitate the access for, and the transfer of, the relevant technologies to developing countries. Access to biological diversity had been granted by the adoption of the Nagoya Protocol on Access and Benefit-sharing, and yet benefit-sharing was somehow missing. There was no protocol to ensure the smooth and proper access of developing countries to technologies, and the current capacity-building programmes under the Convention focused mainly on the regulation of technologies and not the creation, development, access and use of the relevant technologies. The current form of the updated zero draft was not in accordance with Article 16 of the Convention, and he officially requested that proper attention be given to the contributions and statements by Parties that were very well reflected in the report of the second meeting of the Working Group.¹¹ Environmental issues did not recognize man-made political borders, and he gave the example of migratory birds and the recent COVID-19 pandemic, which was not the first time, nor would it be the last time, disease claimed millions of lives. The solution to that disease would probably be found in nature, but it would also require international cooperation. Any failure of that collaboration would have an immediate impact on both biodiversity and public health at both the regional and global

¹¹ [CBD/WG2020/2/4](#); referred to pages with text suggestions for “Target 15 as proposed in the zero draft” (on resources, including capacity-building) and “Target 16 as proposed in the zero draft” (on biotechnology); target numbers were from Jan.2020 zero draft.

levels; the sanctions that the Islamic Republic of Iran was suffering from not only targeted the Islamic Republic of Iran but also the whole world. Those sanctions had sharply affected national plans to conserve biodiversity and halt the degradation of ecosystems, such as the afforestation initiatives relating to mountains and the saving of endangered species. All related activities, including scientific and technical exchanges and including receiving financial support from GEF, had been seriously affected. The Islamic Republic of Iran was prepared to embrace any collaboration to achieve the goals of improving the updated zero draft to accommodate the concerns raised by some countries, which included itself.

United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland

148. The representative of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland did not underestimate the challenge of maintaining the momentum to develop an ambitious and transformational post-2020 global biodiversity framework. Despite the difficulties and uncertainty created by the current COVID-19 pandemic, she looked forward to a renewed impetus arising from this year's General Assembly of the United Nations and its associated Biodiversity Summit. The fifth edition of the *Global Biodiversity Outlook* was a frank and sobering assessment: none of the Aichi Biodiversity Targets had been fully achieved. While it was not too late to act, decisive action had to be taken to "bend the curve", put nature on a path to recovery and deliver the required transformational changes. The updated zero draft was a good basis for that, as it provided greater clarity on the structure of the goals and targets. That had to be built on by addressing the overlaps between some of the goals, milestones and targets; by giving greater prominence to the ocean; and by ensuring that targets were ambitious, evidence-based and measurable, but also clear and easily communicated to drive actions by all sectors of society. However, agreeing to ambitious goals and targets was not sufficient. They should also be underpinned by a transparent monitoring, reporting, and review mechanism that strengthened accountability, drove ambition and ensured implementation, and by the provision of resource mobilization from all sources that was commensurate with the scale of the problem. Her government was concerned that significant work was still required on those and other critical issues which were all closely interlinked. All the participants were encouraged to consider creative ways in which progress could be made to develop common ground and concrete proposals on the issues. A complete package had to be ready by the fifteenth meeting of the Conference of the Parties to avoid further delays in implementation. There was a very strong convergence and interdependence between the policy agendas on biodiversity, climate change and sustainable development, and as co-hosts of the twenty-sixth meeting of the Conference of the Parties to the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change, her Government was committed to putting nature at the heart of tackling climate change.

International Indigenous Forum on Biodiversity

149. The representative of the International Indigenous Forum on Biodiversity reiterated its global commitment to the conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity as a guarantee for life on the planet. Biological and cultural diversity, that is the strategic alliance between nature, culture and indigenous peoples, should be the cross-cutting axis towards action within the new post-2020 global biodiversity framework. That would be the best stimulus for indigenous peoples and local communities that conserved a large part of terrestrial biodiversity in their lands, territories and waters, which were conserved and maintained through their own customary laws on the use and management of biological resources to meet their ways of living and needs in a sustainable way and in balance with nature. Conservation and traditional knowledge were goals that had been identified among the key messages of the *Global Assessment Report on Biodiversity and Ecosystem Services* by the Intergovernmental Science-Policy Platform on Biodiversity and Ecosystem Services, which pointed out that much of the world's wild and domesticated species still survived in areas traditionally managed, owned, used or occupied by indigenous peoples and local communities. That was because of indigenous and local knowledge, and because those societies had resource management and governance structures based on their traditional knowledge. Therefore, those customary practices had to be affirmed, revitalized and supported so that the knowledge could be transmitted from one generation to another for the benefit of biological diversity. The establishment of strategic alliances between indigenous peoples and local communities and the Parties was essential for the full recognition of the customary sustainable use of biodiversity, and he appreciated that the updated zero draft had recognized their participation as a condition for facilitating the implementation of the post-

2020 global biodiversity framework, which should be strongly reflected in its targets and indicators. That would allow the achievement of the 2050 Vision of “Living in harmony with nature”, and the indigenous peoples and local communities were committed to working to achieve that within the modalities that had been adopted to address their concerns about their fundamental rights. The 2030 mission and the goals for 2030 and 2050 should reflect and recognize the joint development of bio-cultural diversity and its inextricable links, as indicated in the Sharm El-Sheikh Declaration on Nature and Culture. He urged that the proposals previously submitted by the IIFB, regarding its comments and inputs on the objectives, targets and indicators for the new post-2020 global framework, be taken into account as a practical examples of mutual cooperation for the conservation and sustainable uses of biodiversity.

Global Youth Biodiversity Network

150. The representative of the Global Youth Biodiversity Network (GYBN) said that the post-2020 global biodiversity framework should lead to system-wide transformative change in all the sectors of society to tackle the biodiversity crisis and achieve the goal of living in harmony within nature. That was a very ambitious vision, and to achieve it required fundamental a shift in systems of values and behaviours. If the goals and targets did not address the underlying issues of biodiversity loss, the failures of the Aichi Biodiversity Targets would be repeated in 2030. Given the worsening pandemic, the move to shift meetings online made sense, but it should be understood that digital participation was exclusionary, and the development of the framework was supposed to take an inclusive and participatory approach. The majority of rural, indigenous and youth communities lacked access to the internet or the means to connect online and would be excluded. Regarding the framework itself, some of the youth priorities had not yet been adequately reflected. A transformative education was crucial for achieving the 2050 vision. It deserved to be set as a stand-alone target, and GYBN supported the text that had been proposed for a target on transformative education on biological and cultural diversity, languages, sustainability and heritage. While human rights were crucial and should be reflected in a number of targets, they were currently subject to national circumstances. There had been a specific proposal to add a new target in the framework that focused on supporting and protecting those individuals and groups who were at the forefront of defending biodiversity and human rights, and who were often at risk as a result. GYBN strongly support that proposal. The importance of ecosystem services and biodiversity for the full enjoyment of human rights could not be overemphasized. Biodiversity around the world was being destroyed at an unprecedented rate, with grave and far-reaching implications for human well-being. A post-2020 global biodiversity framework that was premised on human rights perspectives would help heighten the urgent need to protect biodiversity and promote policy coherence. Finally, intergenerational equity was a fundamental principle for all societies, and justice between generations and within generations had to be pursued. GYBN was therefore happy to see that the updated zero draft had included that principle as an enabling condition, but it also emphasized that it needed to be reflected in the goals and targets as well, as did other crucial principles such as the participation of indigenous peoples and local communities, gender equality, the rights of nature and participation of all relevant stakeholders.

Women’s Caucus

151. The representative of the Women’s Caucus said that 2020 was an important year that marked the 70th anniversary of the Universal Declaration on Human Rights, the 25th anniversary of the Beijing Declaration and Platform for Action, and the tenth anniversary of the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples (UNDRIP). She was concerned that the updated zero draft of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework had not taken up many of the comments made in support of full gender mainstreaming, including the suggestion for a stand-alone target on gender. The rights, roles and contributions of women, as well as those of indigenous peoples, local communities and youth, had not been integrated with the ambition required for the framework to reverse biodiversity loss and ensure that both people and nature could thrive. It was clear that a rights-based approach had yet to be integrated. The fifth edition of the *Global Biodiversity Outlook* clearly showed the systemic failure of the Aichi Biodiversity Targets and how conventional, exclusionary conservation approaches had not been able to halt biodiversity loss. To avoid that from happening again, the framework should include strong measures and mechanisms to enforce inclusive and equitable biodiversity governance at the local, subnational, national, regional and

global levels and increase the reporting and accountability of Parties. Inclusive governance implied gender-responsive, equitable, intergenerational, intercultural, the full, effective and meaningful participation of indigenous peoples and local communities, women and other diverse marginalized and vulnerable groups in decision-making, planning, implementation, reporting and evaluation of the global biodiversity framework. It should ensure that it redirected all perverse incentives and other investments away from projects and sectors that harmed biodiversity and towards gender-responsive governance by indigenous peoples and local communities, to address the critical transitions that had been reflected in the second edition of the *Local Biodiversity Outlooks* for the systemic and cultural change needed to support the ultimate aim of living in harmony with nature. She encouraged Parties to reflect on and respond to the report of the Thematic Workshop on Human Rights as enabling conditions in the post-2020 global biodiversity framework in informing the next version of the global biodiversity framework.

Subnational and local governments

152. The representative of subnational and local governments, speaking behalf of the Advisory Committee on Subnational Governments and Biodiversity, recalled the Edinburgh Process for Subnational and Local Governments on the development of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework, which had been led by the Scottish Government. That process had engaged subnational and local governments that were deeply concerned about the impacts of the loss of biodiversity and climate change on livelihoods and communities. That process, and the Edinburgh Declaration, had been enlightening as it had allowed the participants to see the impact of the decade-long Plan of Action on Subnational Governments, Cities, and Other Local Authorities for Biodiversity (2011-2020). Subnational and local governments strongly supported the call for action included in the Declaration and stood ready to meet the challenges that were faced in delivering the post-2020 global biodiversity framework and in overcoming the devastating consequences of the global COVID-19 pandemic. He called on Parties to adopt a renewed decision [X/22](#), and significantly increase the ambition for subnational and local actions toward implementing the post-2020 global biodiversity framework. Subnational and local governments needed to fulfil their collective potential, and he invited Parties to reach out to their subnational and regional governments and invite them to join in those efforts. The only way to reach the vision of “living in harmony with nature” was to work side by side to achieve the transformative actions that were needed.

CBD Alliance

153. The representative of the CBD Alliance expressed his solidarity with all those suffering from the global COVID-19 pandemic, and issued a global call to action to stop the ecocide that was happening because of the fires taking place around the world, which in most cases had been caused by policies implemented by governments. He was concerned that the Subsidiary Body on Scientific, Technical and Technological Advice would not be allowed to provide advice on goals and target for the post-2020 global biodiversity framework when that was its mandate. Although he did understand the need to avoid any confusion in language, he did not understand why there would be no space for scientific, technical and technological advice. The updated zero draft was not strong enough to deal with the challenges, and did not address the root causes of biodiversity loss. While much attention had been given to targets and goals, if those remained voluntary not much would change in the future. Instead, more attention should be paid to enabling conditions and to ensuring that there was a robust compliance mechanism to assure implementation. The language referring to indigenous peoples and local communities was significantly weaker in the new draft, and did not comply with the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples. Resource mobilization would make little sense if governments continued to invest funding for subsidies, fiscal incentives, infrastructure and other projects that harmed biodiversity, rather than divesting from them and redirecting such funding; redirecting perverse incentives should be an absolute priority of Parties to the Convention. The concept of nature-based solutions remained uncharted and could undermine the long-established ecosystem approach. The enthusiasm for nature-based solutions was being used by proponents of fossil fuel to offset and continue their emissions, instead of addressing the root causes of biodiversity loss. Finally, he suggested that a one-welfare approach should be included in the post-2020 global biodiversity framework, which would address the linkages between humans, animals and nature in a way that extended beyond only addressing human health.

Statement by the representative of the United Nations Environment Management Group

154. The representative of the United Nations Environment Management Group said that following the request of the Co-Chairs of the Open-ended Working Group, the senior officials of that group had met to establish an inter-agency consultative process, composed of 51 agencies, to facilitate a contribution from the United Nations system. Building on that, the consultative process had prepared two contributions to support the development of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework and had submitted them to the Open-ended Working Group. A report describing the approach of the United Nations system had also been prepared and was now in the final stages of endorsement by the Secretary-General and would be available for the meeting of the General Assembly at the end of the month. The report provided information from the 51 members on the relevance of biodiversity for their existing mandates, as well as for their current activities and programmes, and it addressed the key roles that the members of the Environment Management Group could play to support the member States of the United Nations, as well as how their activities could help address the direct and indirect drivers of biodiversity loss within their mandates, in alignment with the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development. The report also contained the high-level statements by the heads of the 51 agencies committing their entities to support member States in the implementation of the global biodiversity framework. Concerned by the negative trends in the status of biodiversity, and the clear evidence of the need to transform humanity's relationship with nature, those agencies had agreed on a number of actions to support member States during the period 2021-2030, including supporting their ability to halt biodiversity loss; sustainable use; enhancing biodiversity through policies and programmes; establishing strong coalitions for biodiversity; mainstreaming biodiversity into the operations of the United Nations; and enhancing coherence and follow-up on biodiversity.

Response of the Co-Chairs of the Working Group

155. Mr. van Havre said that there had clearly been a lot of interest in the process and he thanked the participants for their interventions. One key message had been that there was a need for more space for dialogue; the Co-Chairs would be working with the Bureau and the President of the Conference of the Parties to accommodate that request, and he drew the attention of the meeting to an upcoming stakeholder forum.

156. Mr. Ogwal also thanked the participants for their useful feedback on the updated zero draft. That feedback was essential, as the Open-ended Working Group was developing a framework that would serve as a guide for their actions for the next thirty years.

Summation by the Chair of the Subsidiary Body on Scientific, Technical and Technological Advice

157. The Chair of the Subsidiary Body on Scientific, Technical and Technological Advice said that the deliberations were at a critical stage in the development of specific elements for the global biodiversity framework. It was important to have high-quality constructive discussions on that in the Subsidiary Body in order to provide solid advice to Parties for their deliberations at the third meeting of the Open-ended Working Group. He invited all the participants to be active members at discussions of the Subsidiary Body on Scientific, Technical and Technological Advice, and to provide the best scientific and technical advice rather than political advice. A comprehensive and solid monitoring framework, with a system of indicators at various levels, facilitating national reporting as part of the framework, would make a big difference and build the basis for future implementation and reporting. He looked forward to interesting, informative, constructive and specific discussions at the twenty-fourth meeting of the Subsidiary Body on Scientific, Technical and Technological Advice.

Statement by the incoming Presidency of the Conference of the Parties

158. The representative of China said that it was a great pleasure to represent the incoming presidency of the fifteenth meeting of the Conference of the Parties at the present special joint session, and he expressed his gratitude to Egypt as the Presidency of the Conference of the Parties, and the Secretariat, for the careful organization of the session. The fifth edition of the *Global Biodiversity Outlook* was a reminder that the work being done was critical to reversing the trends in global biodiversity loss. The updated text of the zero draft had provided an opportunity for an in-depth exchange of views and China welcomed the new

version of the text and believed that important progress had been made in the consultation process. China had protected more than 25 per cent of its territory and firmly supported multilateralism, and had always been active in participating in and promoting the multilateral process for biodiversity. It looked forward to working with all Parties to advance the three objectives of the Convention on Biological Diversity in a balanced manner, by upholding the principles of fairness, transparency and the country-driven approach, and promoting a balanced, pragmatic and effective post-2020 global biodiversity framework to promote a more equitable biodiversity governance system. The Biodiversity Summit would be held on 30 September 2020 during the 75th session of the General Assembly. China would also hold an online ministerial round table on 24 September 2020 to further build consensus among Parties. It was hoped that those efforts would be a major step forward in the global biodiversity process. Finally, he thanked the international community for its support for China's preparations for the fifteenth meeting of the Conference of the Parties and said that China looked forward to meeting the participants in Kunming soon.

ITEM 3. CLOSURE OF THE SPECIAL SESSION

159. The Chair of the Subsidiary Body on Scientific, Technical and Technological Advice said that the four-day trial of virtual sessions had provided an opportunity to test a new platform in case it was needed in the future. Together with the Chair of the Subsidiary Body on Implementation, he was grateful for the sustained interest over the three special sessions and for the efforts made to join those meetings despite the challenges involved.

160. After the customary exchange of courtesies, the special joint virtual session of the Subsidiary Body on Scientific, Technical and Technological Advice and the Subsidiary Body on Implementation was closed at 9.10 a.m. on Friday, 18 September 2020.
