



## Convention on Biological Diversity

Distr.  
GENERAL

CBD/POST2020/WS/2019/1/2  
18 January 2019

ENGLISH ONLY

---

### REPORT OF THE REGIONAL CONSULTATION WORKSHOP ON THE POST-2020 GLOBAL BIODIVERSITY FRAMEWORK FOR ASIA AND THE PACIFIC, NAGOYA, JAPAN, 28-31 JANUARY 2019

#### I. BACKGROUND AND PURPOSE

1. The Conference of the Parties to the Convention on Biological Diversity at its fourteenth meeting adopted decision [14/34](#) on the preparatory process for the development of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework and requested the Executive Secretary to facilitate the implementation of the process. In order to support the preparation of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework, an open-ended intersessional working group was established and Mr. Francis Ogwal (Uganda) and Mr. Basile van Havre (Canada) were designated as co-chairs of the working group.
2. In decision 14/34, paragraph 6, the Conference of the Parties urged Parties and invited other Governments and stakeholders to “actively engage and contribute to the process of developing a robust post-2020 global biodiversity framework in order to foster strong ownership of the framework to be agreed and strong support for its immediate implementation”. Therefore, it was agreed that regional and thematic consultation workshops would take place as a platform for the discussions.
3. The Regional Consultation Workshop on the Post-2020 Global Biodiversity Framework for Asia and the Pacific was held from 28 to 31 January 2019, in Nagoya, Aichi Prefecture, Japan. The workshop was organized by the Secretariat of the Convention on Biological Diversity in collaboration with the Ministry of Environment of Japan and the Aichi Prefecture, with the generous support of the Japan Biodiversity Fund, and under the guidance of the Co-Chairs of the Open-ended Working Group. The workshop was attended by representatives of the Parties to the Convention from the region, as well as relevant organizations.<sup>1</sup> The workshop was conducted in English with sessions in plenary and break out groups. Several events also took place on the margins of the consultation workshop, including a reception and excursion hosted by Aichi Prefecture and evening side events on the Satoyama Initiative and on the Japan Biodiversity Fund-IPBES capacity-building activities.
4. The present report details the outcomes of the consultation workshop as they relate to the development of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework. Section III provides an account of the proceedings of the consultation.<sup>2</sup>

#### II. VIEWS ON THE SCOPE AND CONTENT ON THE POST-2020 GLOBAL BIODIVERSITY FRAMEWORK FROM PARTICIPANTS IN THE REGIONAL CONSULTATION WORKSHOP FOR ASIA AND THE PACIFIC

5. The following is a synthesis of the range of views expressed on the possible content and scope of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework arising from the discussions during the regional consultation workshop for Asia and the Pacific. The synthesis provides an overview of the perspectives and views

---

<sup>1</sup> The list of participants in the workshop is accessible from <https://www.cbd.int/doc/c/eecd/fead/bd6ca9e84d659cafa0db3ad9/post2020-ws-2019-01-participants-en.pdf>

<sup>2</sup> See documents [CBD/POST2020/WS/2019/1/1](#) and [CBD/POST2020/WS/2019/1/1/Add.1](#).

expressed. It should not be interpreted as a consensus but, rather, as input for further discussions in the development of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework.

**A. Opportunities and challenges for the post-2020 global framework resulting from the implementation of the strategic plan for biodiversity 2011-2020 in the region**

6. The Asian and Pacific region is rich in biodiversity. It is also a very culturally diverse region where there are many indigenous people and local communities, civil society organizations and businesses who are actively working on issues related to conservation and sustainable use. Similarly, there are numerous biodiversity initiatives, such as the Satoyama Initiative, being implemented across the region. There are opportunities to better document and leverage these efforts in order to safeguard biodiversity. Given the diversity of the region, it was also noted that the region is facing diverse challenges and that, therefore, a variety of solutions to the continuing loss of biodiversity will be needed. In this respect, it is important to learn from others. Similarly, the amount and quality of biodiversity information is increasing rapidly. While this is helpful from a planning perspective, it also creates challenges in internalizing this information and making practical use of it.

7. The region is undergoing relatively rapid population growth, economic development and other socioeconomic changes which will need to be taken into account when developing the post-2020 framework. In general, it was felt that people at the national and local levels are willing to act. However, it was also felt that limited awareness of the importance of biodiversity and of the actions people can take for its protection continues to be a challenge. Some participants noted that emphasis is needed on better communicating the values of high-biodiversity areas, including to the productive sectors, and that ecosystem valuation could be an important tool in this respect. However, several participants noted that it is important to not lose sight of the multiple values of biodiversity and that systems which account for these pluralistic values are needed. It was also noted that a better case needs to be made for why investing in biodiversity conservation and sustainable use makes good economic sense. The importance of paying greater attention to sustainable consumption and production, and mainstreaming, in the post-2020 period was also noted by many participants.

8. While the region has many protected areas, not all key biodiversity areas are covered. Further, there is a need for improvement in the management and governance of protected areas to make them more effective in conserving biodiversity. Despite the progress made on protected areas, terrestrial, marine and aquatic habitats continue to be lost generally. There is also a challenge in managing protected areas as well as high-value biodiversity areas in relation to sustainable use.

9. The importance of having a post-2020 framework which is more quantitative than the current Strategic Plan was noted. The need for more practical and relevant national biodiversity indicators was also highlighted. The *Regional Assessment Report on Biodiversity and Ecosystem Services for Asia and the Pacific* undertaken by the Intergovernmental Science-Policy Platform on Biodiversity and Ecosystem Services (IPBES) provides a good scientific basis for developing such a plan and for underpinning action.

10. While the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020 provided a good global framework, which was generally viewed as ambitious, many participants noted that it may have been unrealistic and that the biodiversity community should learn from the successes and challenges of its implementation. For example, it was noted that, by moving beyond conservation issues, the Strategic Plan necessitated that Governments and stakeholders engage with actors in “non-traditional” biodiversity arenas. This was a challenge to the implementation of the Strategic Plan. Other challenges noted were the lack of resources, delays in revising, updating, or developing national biodiversity strategies and action plans (NBSAPs), delays in identifying indicators and relying on indicators that could not be easily adapted to national circumstances. It was also suggested that, in the post-2020 global biodiversity framework, a greater emphasis be placed on mainstreaming, and more work is needed to develop a theory of change so that the framework can be more useful from a planning perspective. Further, the need to develop and/or promote means of better measuring national contributions to global targets was emphasized, as was the need to phrase global targets as real targets and not as outcomes or outputs.

11. With the adoption of the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development, there is a need to consider how future biodiversity targets will relate to or compliment the Sustainable Development Goals. Similarly, the need to link future biodiversity targets to the climate change agenda was also noted. In this respect, the importance of nature-based solutions for climate change mitigation and adaptation was noted.

12. The need for more integrated and cooperative approaches in implementing the Convention and other biodiversity related conventions and agreements was also noted. In addition, there is a need for simplified reporting processes to make it easier for all stakeholders to report on the actions taken to conserve biodiversity.

13. Most countries have existing biodiversity policies and/or legislation from which to build. In this respect, NBSAPs were seen as being particularly useful. However, it was noted that awareness of NBSAPs needs to be increased and their implementation needs to be strengthened. NBSAPs, policies and legislation need to be better integrated into sectors not directly related to biodiversity. The need to better reflect land use decisions in NBSAPs was also noted. Further, while the main responsibility for implementing the Convention lies with countries, there is a growing need to work with indigenous peoples and local communities, civil society organizations and the private sector. Therefore, a related challenge lies in finding ways to bring these other stakeholders into decision-making processes regarding biodiversity.

14. The importance of mainstreaming in encouraging action for biodiversity was also noted, as was the potential value of better spatial planning and enhanced biodiversity monitoring. Similarly, the importance of national reporting was highlighted, and several participants noted the need to take this process more seriously, in terms of respecting reporting deadlines, in promoting national coordination in the preparation of the report and in ensuring national ownership of its findings.

15. There is a general need for more resources, including human, technical and financial, for the implementation of the Convention. It was suggested that linking funding opportunities to the Aichi Biodiversity Targets or their successors could be one means of increasing the resources available.

## **B. Visioning the world we want**

16. There was general recognition that current trends regarding biodiversity are alarming and that, therefore, business as usual will not be sufficient to reach the 2050 Vision for Biodiversity of living in harmony with nature. There was also recognition of the opportunity that the post-2020 global biodiversity framework represents in terms of setting ambitious objectives for biodiversity. Various ideas of what changes are needed in the region were expressed. Similarly, different ideas of what “living in harmony with nature” means in concrete terms were also expressed. While these various ideas are presented below as distinct points, most are not exclusive of any other. The ideas expressed were:

(a) *Enhancing awareness*: It was noted that policymakers need to be more aware of the importance of biodiversity. Similarly, the need to increase the awareness of other key actors, including those from sectors that have an impact on biodiversity, was observed. One of the objectives of raising awareness should be to bring about behavioural change. The need for communication strategies that can be used to communicate the post-2020 framework effectively, including its targets, at the national and local levels was also noted. The need for the post-2020 framework to demonstrate how any target can be achieved and to communicate the costs of inaction was also discussed. It was also suggested that part of the process of raising awareness could be undertaking economic valuations of biodiversity;

(b) *Mainstreaming*: Biodiversity needs to be considered across society so that there is a better balance between economic development and environmental sustainability. The potential role of environmental impact assessments and strategic environmental impact assessments was noted in this regard;

(c) *Governance*: Existing legislation needs to be better enforced, new legislation needs to be developed and there needs to be a greater use of incentives and subsidies to promote positive actions for biodiversity, to engage other sectors and to promote partnerships. In addition to legislation, the need for different governance models, including multilevel governance, was noted. The need for governance

systems that are inclusive, respect rights, including the right to self-determination, and that account for economic and social inequalities was also noted by some participants. Governance systems also need to be more transparent;

(d) *Synergies*: There is a need for greater interaction and/or cooperation between the Convention, the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development, and other multilateral environmental agreements. Similarly, biodiversity needs to be more strongly reflected or considered in actions to address climate change;

(e) *Technology*: There are a number of technologies, including artificial intelligence and block chain, which could be leveraged for biodiversity conservation and sustainable use. However, some participants also cautioned against technological solutions and noted the need to make sure the right technologies are used;

(f) *Engagement*: While Governments will have a key role in bringing about a world living in harmony with nature, there is also a need for greater involvement and/or engagement of indigenous peoples and local communities, civil society organizations, youth, and the private sector in biodiversity decisions and management. It was noted that indicators showing the extent to which people are involved in biodiversity actions would be helpful;

(g) *Human focus* – Many participants expressed the view that a transition to a world living in harmony with nature would require a greater focus on the human elements and aspects of biodiversity management and sustainable development. This includes addressing the growing disconnect between urban dwellers and nature/biodiversity.

17. Participants identified a number of elements or issues that could be included or reflected in the post-2020 global biodiversity framework in order to bring about the transitions noted above. These include:

- (a) Better biodiversity knowledge and data;
- (b) Better indicators for monitoring implementation, including the greater recognition and promotion of community indicators and processes, such as biocultural community protocols;
- (c) Improved and dedicated resources, including financial, technological and capacity-building, for implementation;
- (d) A greater focus on the importance of investment in natural capital and nature-based solutions;

18. Participants also expressed various ideas as to what “living in harmony with nature” means in concrete terms. The ideas expressed were:

- (a) No more degraded lands;
- (b) Less pollution;
- (c) More green spaces;
- (d) Less drought and desertification;
- (e) Sustainability in all sectors;
- (f) More ecologically friendly and innovative practices;
- (g) Zero extinction;
- (h) 30 per cent of marine environments protected;
- (i) Enhanced fish stocks;
- (j) Halve the loss of functions of various ecosystems;
- (k) Wise and sustainable use of biodiversity;
- (l) Human and wildlife co-existence.

19. Participants also considered the possible elements of a 2030 mission statement for the post-2020 global biodiversity framework. Generally, there was a view that the mission statement should focus on issues related to sustainable use, how people use biodiversity and how this impacts the future. It was also suggested that the mission statement should somehow be linked to and/or supportive of the objectives of other multilateral environmental agreements. It was also expressed that the mission statement should have strong and clear language. Some participants expressed the view that the mission statement should be developed only once the future biodiversity targets and other elements of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework have been adopted. More specific elements that were identified as possible elements of the 2030 mission statement were:

- (a) Sustainable financing, capacity and technology transfer;
- (b) Nature-based solutions, including indigenous innovative knowledge;
- (c) Cross-sector and multilevel governance;
- (d) Inclusive of all relevant stakeholders;
- (e) Integrating traditional knowledge;
- (f) Legislation on access and benefit-sharing;
- (g) Human rights;
- (h) Natural disasters (glacier retreat, sea level rise and others);
- (i) Buffer zone and other biodiversity hotspot management;
- (j) Recognition of other effective conservation measures;
- (k) Rights for nature.

### **C. Elements for a post-2020 framework and 2050 Vision**

20. During the workshop, participants shared ideas on the possible scope and content of different elements of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework:

#### *1. Structure of the framework*

21. Participants identified three possible scenarios for the post-2020 global biodiversity framework. The first was to adopt a structure or framework similar to what was used in the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020. The second was to take what was used for the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020 and modify it to reflect new elements and information. The third was to develop an entirely new structure. There appeared to be a consensus that the second option would be the most favourable, allowing enhanced commitment and the possibility to add neglected areas but also minimal interruption of processes already under way (some of which have not yet had enough time to be impactful). Regardless of the approach that is taken, the new framework needs to be ambitious but realistic and be framed in terms of the enhanced actions that need to be taken to collectively “bend the curve” of biodiversity loss. The need to consider the frameworks of other Rio conventions and multilateral environmental agreements was also noted.

22. The Aichi Biodiversity Targets were generally regarded as useful and, therefore, some participants were of the opinion that they should be used as a basis in developing the post-2020 global biodiversity framework. However, it was also noted that some documentation and or messaging should be developed to explain why the Aichi Targets were not reached and what lessons can be drawn. The idea of grouping or clustering similar targets was suggested as means of more easily communicating the post-2020 global biodiversity framework.

23. The way to reflect cross-cutting issues in the post-2020 framework was also discussed. With regard to gender, it was felt that this issue should not be addressed through a specific target but rather kept as a cross-cutting issue addressed through a preambular paragraph or other elements of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework. A similar approach was also suggested for addressing issues related to the financial mechanism for the Convention.

24. With regard to access and benefit-sharing, it was felt that this should be reflected in the post-2020 global biodiversity framework in the form of a target, while, for biosafety, it was felt that this could be addressed through a target related to agriculture or in some preambular text of the framework.

25. The need for better biodiversity and implementation data needs to be reflected in the post-2020 framework. The post-2020 framework should also emphasize the role of Parties in implementing it by using clear, concise and unambiguous language about their role in implementation.

## 2. *Sustainable Development Goals*

26. It was observed that the Sustainable Development Goals have a higher political profile than biodiversity targets. Therefore, linking the implementation of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework to the fulfilment of the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development was noted as important. It was suggested that future biodiversity targets should be formulated in such a way as to be easily linked to the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development.

## 3. *Mainstreaming*

27. Many participants noted that the issue of mainstreaming should be strongly reflected in the post-2020 global biodiversity framework. It was observed that many of the direct and indirect drivers of biodiversity loss lie outside the influence of environment ministries and that, therefore, the pathway for addressing them must take a broad perspective. The importance of having simple and easy-to-understand targets was highlighted as a means of supporting mainstreaming and the uptake of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework by other sectors and actors. The importance of linking the post-2020 global biodiversity framework to other societal challenges, including climate change, disaster risk reduction, development, nutrition, human health, hunger and poverty alleviation was noted. In this respect, the importance of ensuring coherence between the post-2020 global biodiversity framework and the strategies, frameworks and targets of other international agreements was noted. The importance of reflecting issues related to the green economy, making greater use of market-based approaches, such as certification, integrating biodiversity into all aspects of production, including supply chains, and developing economic models that better account for conservation, biodiversity loss and externalities was also noted. Some participants commented that the issue of mainstreaming is not clearly defined and that, therefore, an agreed definition under the Convention may be needed. In this context, it was noted that the Global Environment Facility had developed a definition that might be useful. There were different ideas on how mainstreaming could be reflected in the post-2020 global biodiversity framework. Some felt that it should be viewed as an approach or tool for implementation and not as a target in and of itself. Another view was that it could be embedded or reflected in targets related to productive sectors. Some also suggested that mainstreaming could be an overarching goal or that it could be included in preambular paragraphs or other overarching sections of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework. Questions were also raised as to the feasibility of having a “SMART” target on mainstreaming or an indicator to monitor its progress. More generally, it was noted that addressing biodiversity loss is such a large problem that Governments will not be able to address it on their own, and that, therefore, there is a need to build partnerships and the post-2020 global biodiversity framework should enable this.

## 4. *Resource mobilization*

28. Many participants noted the need for an integrated resource mobilization strategy as well as the need to look beyond traditional sources of funding for biodiversity for the post-2020 period. Some participants expressed the view that the resource mobilization strategy and/or any targets related to resource mobilization should be informed by an assessment of what would be required to implement the post-2020 global biodiversity framework and to implement NBSAPs. The need for indicators for resource mobilization was also noted. The potential role of regional and development banks, the private sector, other sectors, innovative financial mechanisms, biodiversity offsets and partnerships was highlighted in this respect. It was also suggested that positioning the post-2020 global biodiversity framework, and national actions to implement it, as being contributions to sustainable development could help to generate funds for biodiversity and influence how biodiversity investments are viewed. Similarly, linking biodiversity

financing to climate change could also help to increase the resources available. In that connection, the need to tap into resources that are available through government ministries, other than those related to the environment, was noted. More generally, the need for a more effective and strategic use of resources, including financial, technical and human, was noted. With regard to the Global Environment Facility, some participants felt that simpler procedures were required to access financial support and some participants suggested that the potential for developing new funding mechanisms, similar to the Green Climate Fund adopted under the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC), should be explored.

#### 5. *Voluntary commitments*

29. Participants generally felt that there is a need for both global targets and voluntary commitments. However, there is a need for clear guidance on what type of commitments are expected and by whom. Several participants noted that commitments should be made by Parties but also by stakeholders, that commitments should not just focus on “quantitative” aspects but also on qualitative issues, and that commitments should also be focused on bringing about behavioural change. Some participants held the view that ambitious and/or innovative commitments should be recognized under the Convention and that multinational or multi-organizational commitments should be encouraged. Some felt that clear accountability and transparency mechanisms for voluntary commitments are needed. Others expressed the view that, if commitments are voluntary, mechanisms need to be in place so that commitments do not become “watered down” and that actions are taken.

#### 6. *Communication*

30. The majority of participants emphasized that communication will be important in the post-2020 period and that communication at all levels will be required. For this reason, it may be necessary to use different communication pathways. The need for clear messages was noted, as was the need to develop national communication strategies related to the post-2020 global biodiversity framework. However, it was also noted that the implementation of national communication strategies will require sustained financial resources. It was also noted that tools, indicators and other resources are needed to assess the effectiveness of communication efforts in reaching relevant audiences. In this light, the importance of ensuring that biodiversity is reflected in school curriculums and in other educational mediums was noted. Aichi Biodiversity Target 1 (awareness raising) was noted as still being relevant and could be considered in the post-2020 global biodiversity framework. However, it was also noted that Aichi Biodiversity Target 1 is not easy to measure, and, therefore, it was suggested that it could be part of a target rather than a target itself.

#### 7. *Capacity-building*

31. Capacity-building was noted as an important issue for the post-2020 global biodiversity framework. Some suggested that there should be a specific target on capacity-building. However, there appeared to be a general view that it would be better reflected in the post-2020 global biodiversity framework as a cross-cutting element or in the preamble to the framework. It was also suggested that capacity-building could be an indicator for the post-2020 global biodiversity framework. The need for an evaluation of capacity-building needs to help inform the development of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework and its implementation was noted.

#### 8. *Integrating diverse perspectives*

32. The need for the post-2020 global biodiversity framework to consider diverse perspectives on biodiversity issues was noted. The desirability of having a global mandate to do this was emphasized. The practice used in some countries of having stakeholders’ committees or groups participate in the development and implementation of NBSAPs was highlighted as a good practice which could be emulated. It was also noted that, in some countries, it remains challenging for stakeholders to participate in such processes. The need for increased transparency and accountability was noted and it was suggested that collaborative partnerships could be one way of accomplishing this. Specifically, with regard to business

engagement, it was suggested that Parties need to explicitly express what is requested of businesses to facilitate their involvement and engagement. It was also noted that the business community cannot be treated as one homogenous group of entities. With regard to the structure of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework, there was a general preference for having the participation of diverse groups reflected throughout the post-2020 global biodiversity framework as a cross-cutting issue or as preambular text rather than having a specific target on this issue. However, the importance of developing an indicator to monitor engagement was noted. One specific suggestion related to the Convention more generally was to end the practice of referring to indigenous peoples and local communities, civil society organizations, youth and other groups as “observers” and to instead refer to them as “partners” to more accurately reflect their role in the implementation of the Convention.

#### *9. National biodiversity strategies and action plans*

33. The NBSAPs are regarded as the main implementation mechanism under the Convention and participants expressed the view that this should continue to be the case in the post-2020 period. However, many participants expressed the view that limited political awareness and willingness are major obstacles to the implementation of the NBSAPs and the Convention generally. It was also observed that many NBSAPs are not well aligned with the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020 as they are tailored to national circumstances. Similarly, while the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020 was a useful global framework, participants expressed the view that more work was needed to internalize the plan at the national level. This makes it difficult to link their implementation back to the progress made in addressing the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020. Limited financial resources were also identified as a major obstacle in some countries. A further challenge that will need to be addressed in the post-2020 period is limited data availability and access. The use of national coordination mechanisms, which span different levels of government, was identified as a possible solution to some of these challenges. While some participants noted that it would not be desirable to embark on a new process to revise NBSAPs once the post-2020 framework was adopted, others highlighted the fact that the NBSAPs of many countries expire in or shortly after 2020 and would need to be updated anyway. Some noted that the NBSAP revision exercise was an important national process for raising awareness and bringing stakeholders together.

#### *10. Review mechanisms*

34. It was felt that national biodiversity legislation could play an important role in enhancing implementation. Many participants also noted the need for enhanced enforcement and compliance mechanisms for the post-2020 global biodiversity framework. However, others noted that, as the Convention on Biological Diversity is a “soft” legal agreement, it was not clear what such a mechanism could be. The need for regular reviews of progress in implementation was noted, with suggestions that reviews be undertaken yearly, every two years or every five years. The potential role of voluntary peer-review mechanisms was also identified, as was the development of “ratcheting up” mechanisms to increase national commitments. The need for indicators and baselines to monitor progress was noted, and the potential role of community-based monitoring systems was highlighted by some participants.

35. Overall, participants generally expressed the view that the structure, scope and content of the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020 provides a good basis for developing the post-2020 global biodiversity framework. Further, it was generally felt that the post-2020 framework needs to build from the success achieved over the last 10 years. In this light, several participants emphasized that there are still two years left to implement the current Strategic Plan and that efforts for this need to continue. Further, the importance of undertaking a critical analysis of the implementation of the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020 was emphasized. This analysis should also take into account the socioeconomic, technological and knowledge advancements which have taken place since the Plan was adopted in 2010. It was also observed that some issues will need to be addressed more explicitly in the post-2020 global biodiversity framework, including issues related to human well-being, consumption and sustainable use. It was noted that the recent recommendations from the Subsidiary Body on Scientific, Technical and Technological Advice and the Subsidiary Body on Implementation provide guidance in this respect.



36. While there was general agreement regarding the need to build on the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020, the need for “outside the box” thinking was also noted. In particular, the need for ways to make the post-2020 framework more achievable, effective and easier to monitor was noted. The need to promote more coordinated approaches to the implementation of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework was also suggested. In this light, it was suggested that out-of-the-box thinking is required more for the implementation of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework rather than for its structure. A possible tool to assist with implementation could be the development of documentation that provides guidance on how the post-2020 global biodiversity framework could be addressed at the regional, national and subnational levels. It also noted that thought needs to be given to how to best create transformations in people’s relationship with biodiversity and how to create opportunities for people from diverse perspectives, background and interests to engage in the process. The potential role of community conserved areas in engaging people was noted by some participants. The importance of creating self-sustaining initiatives for biodiversity was highlighted, as was the need to consider how to bring about large-scale investments for biodiversity.

### **III. PROCEEDINGS OF THE CONSULTATION WORKSHOP**

#### **A. Opening of the consultation and organizational matters**

37. The consultation was opened on 28 January 2019 by His Excellency, Mr. Minoru Kiuchi, State Minister of the Environment of Japan. In his remarks,<sup>3</sup> he welcomed the participants to the consultation and noted the symbolism of beginning the discussions on the post-2020 framework in the same place where the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020 had been adopted. He called on the Asian and Pacific region to bring together its collective wisdom to help chart a course for reaching the 2050 Vision of living in harmony with nature. Following his remarks, Mr. Toshihiro Morita, Director-General, Department of the Environment, Aichi Prefecture, welcomed participants to the Aichi Prefecture and noted that the Prefecture had been working on the conservation and revitalization of biodiversity in collaboration with various groups in order to reach the Aichi Biodiversity Targets.<sup>4</sup> In particular, he noted the efforts of the Prefecture in relation to the Group of Leading Subnational Governments towards the Aichi Biodiversity Targets.

38. Ms. Jyoti Mathur-Filipp, Director of the Implementation Support Division, delivered opening remarks on behalf of Ms. Cristiana Paşca Palmer, Executive Secretary of the Convention on Biological Diversity. In her remarks,<sup>5</sup> she noted that the fourteenth meeting of the Conference of the Parties to the Convention on Biological Diversity had formally had set in motion the preparatory process for crafting a post-2020 global biodiversity framework and that the Asia-Pacific workshop would be one of several regional and thematic consultations in which Parties, civil society organizations, women’s groups, indigenous peoples and local communities, youth, business and private sector associations, and academia – all stakeholders – would deliberate on the successes and challenges of collective efforts to safeguard nature within the framework of the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020, and to provide inputs for an ambitious but solid way forward. She also thanked the Ministry of Environment of Japan, Aichi Prefecture and the Japan Biodiversity Fund for supporting the consultation workshop.

39. The Co-Chairs of the Open-ended Working Group, Mr. Francis Ogwal (Uganda) and Mr. Basile van Havre (Canada), provided an overview of the process for developing the post-2020 global biodiversity framework. They explained the contents of decision 14/34 and confirmed their commitment to ensuring that the post-2020 process adhered to the principles enshrined in the decision. They noted that the process for developing the post-2020 global biodiversity framework would have three “phases”: one to collect views from the regions through consultations; one to undertake thematic consultations; and one to bring

---

<sup>3</sup> The complete text of the statement is accessible from <https://www.cbd.int/doc/c/ee35/a5dd/2397946b9569a11532a56edb/post2020-ws-2019-01-opening-statement-japan-en.pdf>

<sup>4</sup> The complete text of the statement is accessible from <https://www.cbd.int/doc/c/ee35/a5dd/2397946b9569a11532a56edb/post2020-ws-2019-01-opening-statement-japan-en.pdf>

<sup>5</sup> The complete text of the statement is accessible from <https://www.cbd.int/doc/speech/2019/sp-2019-01-28-post2020-nagoya-en.pdf>

those two elements together so that they could be considered by the Open-ended Working Group on the Post-2020 Global Biodiversity Framework. In concluding, they noted that the purpose of the regional consultations was not about coming to agreed conclusions but rather to identify issues and to begin exchanging views.<sup>6</sup>

40. Following the opening remarks, Ms. Jyoti Mathur-Filipp (CBD) provided an overview of the agenda for the consultation. Participants then decided that Ms. Leina El-Awadhi (Kuwait) and Mr. Kazuaki Hoshino (Japan) would serve as co-chairs for the meeting. It was also decided that Ms. Rosemary Paterson (New Zealand) would serve as rapporteur and that Ms. Suneetha M. Subramanian (Institute for Global Environmental Strategies) would serve as a facilitator for the consultation. Participants then introduced themselves and outlined their expectations for the consultation.<sup>7</sup>

## B. Current state of affairs and future trends

41. This session addressed the current state of biodiversity and future trends. Mr. Kieran Mooney (CBD) provided an overview of information from the fourth edition of the *Global Biodiversity Outlook*, recent work undertaken by the Subsidiary Body on Scientific, Technical and Technological Advice, the preparation of the fifth edition of the *Global Biodiversity Outlook* and the sixth national reports.<sup>8</sup> Following this, Ms. Sonali Senaratna Sellamuttu (IPBES) and Mr. Madhav Karki (IPBES) provided an overview of the *Regional Assessment Report on Biodiversity and Ecosystem Services for Asia and Pacific* undertaken by the Intergovernmental Science-Policy Platform on Biodiversity and Ecosystem Services (IPBES).<sup>9</sup> Mr. Jing Xu (China),<sup>10</sup> Mr. Keiichi Nakazawa (Japan),<sup>11</sup> Mr. Ghanim Abdulla M. Alboloushi (Qatar),<sup>12</sup> Ms. Czarina Stowers (Samoa)<sup>13</sup> and Ms. Benchamaporn Wattanatongchai (Thailand)<sup>14</sup> gave presentations on the experience of their countries in implementing the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020 on the basis of their sixth national reports. Following the presentations, participants formed discussion groups to reflect on the opportunities and challenges for the region in attaining “sustainability” and “living in harmony with nature” as well as on how the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020 enabled (or not) national implementation action. Following the group discussions, each group provided a report to the plenary.

42. Several international organizations that helped to support Parties in implementing the Convention on Biological Diversity and the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity then participated in a panel discussion on the opportunities, challenges and insights from their work relevant to the development of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework. The members of the Panel were Mr. Mark Zimsky (Global Environmental Facility), Ms. Makiko Yashiro (United Nations Environment Programme – Regional Office for Asia and the Pacific), Mr. Paulo Lourenco Dias Nunes (Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations),

<sup>6</sup> The co-chairs presentation is accessible from <https://www.cbd.int/doc/c/9939/6064/6883a7079a9dfd1efc5ba898/post2020-ws-2019-01-presentation-co-chairs-02-en.pdf>

<sup>7</sup> The list of participants for the consultation is accessible from <https://www.cbd.int/doc/c/eedc/fead/bd6ca9e84d659cafa0db3ad9/post2020-ws-2019-01-participants-en.pdf>

<sup>8</sup> The presentation is accessible from <https://www.cbd.int/doc/c/08a0/0805/12d7831a1dea9ff8edd0e50e/post2020-ws-2019-01-presentation-scbd-02-en.pdf>

<sup>9</sup> The presentation is accessible from <https://www.cbd.int/doc/c/e9fa/3aad/e351dc1ad8d24ffbb101892f/post2020-ws-2019-01-presentation-ipbes-02-en.pdf>

<sup>10</sup> The presentation is accessible from <https://www.cbd.int/doc/c/9758/7732/1ace88580213dba71928e47f/post2020-ws-2019-01-presentation-china-en.pdf>

<sup>11</sup> The presentation is accessible from <https://www.cbd.int/doc/c/3a42/87f1/9f3f51e3ed7584cabe41cefa/post2020-ws-2019-01-presentation-japan-en.pdf>

<sup>12</sup> The presentation is accessible from <https://www.cbd.int/doc/c/c872/f032/8aef44c30dcebea4a484e072/post2020-ws-2019-01-presentation-qatar-en.pdf>

<sup>13</sup> The presentation is accessible from <https://www.cbd.int/doc/c/6e34/9407/6648b68e56b3bdbffe82f319/post2020-ws-2019-01-presentation-samoa-en.pdf>

<sup>14</sup> The presentation is accessible from <https://www.cbd.int/doc/c/a3dc/43c0/804817e33c2f659cb9c240a9/post2020-ws-2019-01-presentation-thailand-en.pdf>

Ms. Jamison Ervin (United Nations Development Programme) and Ms. Theresa Mundita Lim (ASEAN Centre for Biodiversity). The panellists then addressed questions from participants.

### **C. Visioning the world we want**

43. During this session, Ms. Jyoti Mathur-Filipp (CBD) made a presentation<sup>15</sup> on transition management. Following the presentation, participants separated into discussion groups to consider what the 2050 Vision for Biodiversity would mean in concrete terms for the region. Following the group discussions, each group provided a report back to plenary.

### **D. Integrating diverse perspectives**

44. During this session, several participants representing observer organizations provided their views on the possible scope and elements of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework. Presentations were made by Ms. Mrinalini Rai (CBD Alliance),<sup>16</sup> Ms. Jocelyn Carino-Nettleton (Partners for Indigenous Knowledge Philippines),<sup>17</sup> Mr. Hiroaki Takiguchi (United Nations University – Institute for the Advanced Study of Sustainability),<sup>18</sup> Mr. Teru Kisuna (Aichi Prefecture),<sup>19</sup> Mr. Kier Pitogo (Global Youth Biodiversity Network)<sup>20</sup> and Mr. Naoki Adachi (Japan Business Initiative for Biodiversity).<sup>21</sup> Following the presentations, presenters responded to questions from the participants.

### **E. Shaping and communicating new narratives for biodiversity**

45. During this session, Ms. Nadine Saad (CBD) made a presentation on communication for the post-2020 biodiversity framework.<sup>22</sup> Following the presentation, the presenter took questions from the participants.

### **F. Elements for a post-2020 framework**

46. During this session, Ms. Leina El-Awadhi (Kuwait) and Mr. Kazuaki Hoshino (Japan), the co-chairs of the Regional Consultation Workshop, provided their reflections on the views raised theretofore. Subsequently, Ms. Sonali Senaratna Sellamuttu (IPBES) and Mr. Madhav Karki (IPBES) presented the policy options emerging from the IPBES Asian and Pacific regional assessment on biodiversity and ecosystem services.<sup>23</sup> Further, the Co-Chairs of the Open-ended Working Group, introduced the discussion paper on the post-2020 global biodiversity framework.<sup>24</sup> In their intervention, they summarized decisions and recommendations adopted by the decision-making and subsidiary bodies of the Convention and its Protocols relevant to the development of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework, summarized the

<sup>15</sup> The presentation is accessible from <https://www.cbd.int/doc/c/07a5/8453/0156d68d62ba9b5d61a63b5c/post2020-ws-2019-01-presentation-scbd-03-en.pdf>

<sup>16</sup> The presentation is accessible from <https://www.cbd.int/doc/c/a7d8/6d59/9c6717619f275a91ff4b160b/post2020-ws-2019-01-presentation-cbdalliance-en.pdf>

<sup>17</sup> The presentation is accessible from <https://www.cbd.int/doc/c/30bf/061a/b5a1fa9e4d43dac14cae44ce/post2020-ws-2019-01-presentation-iplc-en.pdf>

<sup>18</sup> The presentation is accessible from <https://www.cbd.int/doc/c/d950/e1ff/ee0e008047749728f875778e/post2020-ws-2019-01-presentation-unu-ias-en.pdf>

<sup>19</sup> The presentation is accessible from <https://www.cbd.int/doc/c/bc30/8981/226bd97ab5c8c318e941f82e/post2020-ws-2019-01-presentation-aichiprefecture-en.pdf>

<sup>20</sup> The presentation is accessible from <https://www.cbd.int/doc/c/2867/adf4/809b211d0603395db7623f0a/post2020-ws-2019-01-presentation-gybn-en.pdf>

<sup>21</sup> The presentation is accessible from <https://www.cbd.int/doc/c/d289/e230/3e24b000c0a890b4b1f96555/post2020-ws-2019-01-presentation-jbib-en.pdf>

<sup>22</sup> The presentation is accessible from <https://www.cbd.int/doc/c/f490/ab38/838cee48fbbc87a1d448811d/post2020-ws-2019-01-presentation-scbd-01-en.pdf>

<sup>23</sup> The presentation is accessible from <https://www.cbd.int/doc/c/497c/8943/7599d330fef7b620e12e812d/post2020-ws-2019-01-presentation-ipbes-01-en.pdf>

<sup>24</sup> The presentation is accessible from <https://www.cbd.int/doc/c/3066/5a44/a4519075cc314e0587acfa5/post2020-ws-2019-01-presentation-co-chairs-01-en.pdf>

submissions already received on scope and content of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework and introduced a set of discussion questions.

47. Subsequently, participants separated into groups to consider issues related to the possible scope and content of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework. The issues considered were the following:

- (a) The structure of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework;
- (b) Biodiversity targets;
- (c) The relationship with the Protocols;
- (d) Mainstreaming;
- (e) Relationship with other relevant processes;
- (f) Resource mobilization;
- (g) Voluntary commitments and contributions;
- (h) Communication and outreach;
- (i) Capacity-building and technical and scientific cooperation;
- (j) Integrating diverse perspectives;
- (k) Gender;
- (l) Implementation and NBSAPs;
- (m) Review processes.

Each group considered all of the issues, and facilitators for each group then reported back to the plenary for further discussion.

48. During this session, participants also reflected on the need for “out-of-the-box” thinking for the post-2020 global biodiversity framework and on the extent to which the post-2020 framework should build on the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020. Participants also reflected on what elements, in addition to resource mobilization, capacity-building and communication, would be critical in the post-2020 period. Following the group discussions, each group reported back to the plenary.

#### **G. Closure of the workshop**

49. During this session, participants shared their reflections on the outcomes of the consultation workshop. Mr. Francis Ogwal and Mr. Basile van Havre, the Co-Chairs of the Open-ended Working Group, reflected on the regional consultation and outlined the next steps and expectations in the process for developing the post-2020 global biodiversity framework. Following closing remarks by Ms. Jyoti Mathur-Filipp (CBD), Mr. Keiichi Nakazawa (Japan) and Mr. Teru Kisuna (Aichi Prefecture) the workshop closed.

---