



Convention on Biological Diversity

Distr.
GENERAL

CBD/POST2020/WS/2019/3/2
23 May 2019

ORIGINAL: ENGLISH

REPORT OF THE REGIONAL CONSULTATION ON THE POST-2020 GLOBAL BIODIVERSITY FRAMEWORK FOR AFRICA, ADDIS ABABA, 2-5 APRIL 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. 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 paragraph 6 of the same decision, 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”. In this regard, it was agreed that regional and thematic consultations would be organized to provide a platform for discussions and the active engagement of all relevant stakeholders.
3. The Regional Consultation on the Post-2020 Global Biodiversity Framework for Africa was organized by the Secretariat of the Convention in collaboration with the African Union Commission and the African Union Development Agency/New Partnership for Africa’s Development (AUDA-NEPAD), with funding support from the Government of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland and AUDA-NEPAD. The SABI Strategy Group also provided funding that enabled the participation of two civil society organizations.
4. The Consultation was organized under the guidance of the Co-Chairs of the Open-ended Working Group on the Post-2020 Global Biodiversity Framework and the oversight of the Bureau of the Conference of the Parties. It was attended by a total of 91 participants, including representatives of Parties, other Governments, indigenous peoples and local communities in the region, as well as relevant organizations, including United Nations organizations and programmes, other multilateral environmental agreements, intergovernmental organizations, non-governmental organizations, women’s and youth groups, the scientific community and academia.
5. The present report summarizes the main outcomes of the consultation in section II and provides an account of the proceedings of the consultation on section III.

II. VIEWS AND PERSPECTIVES REGARDING THE POST-2020 GLOBAL BIODIVERSITY FRAMEWORK

6. The following is a synthesis of the general views and perspectives expressed by participants during the consultation regarding the post-2020 global biodiversity framework, taking into account the experiences and lessons learned from the implementation of the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020, the opportunities and challenges from a regional perspective as well as insights on how the mission and the 2050 vision of “living in harmony with nature” could be achieved. 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

7. Participants identified a number of opportunities and challenges in the region that could impact on the implementation of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework and the realization of the 2050 vision of “living in harmony with nature. They also noted that the process of developing the post-2020 global biodiversity framework presented an opportunity to learn from previous experiences, promote best practices and avoid past mistakes. It also provided an opportunity to review and align the Aichi Biodiversity Targets with the Sustainable Development Goals and with other relevant global and regional processes and agendas, including the African Union Agenda 2063: The Africa We Want.¹

8. It was observed that African countries, though diverse, had a common heritage and very rich biodiversity and traditional knowledge which, if harnessed sustainably, could drive and enhance innovation to contribute to sustainable development and the reversal of the impacts of climate change using nature-based solutions. Africa has an extensive network of protected areas and a number of biodiversity management initiatives and programmes, applying various approaches, such as integrated coastal zone management, marine spatial planning, landscape management and spatial land-use planning.

9. Participants also noted that there were a number of national and regional policy frameworks in place, which provided unique opportunities to move the post-2020 biodiversity agenda forward. For example, all Parties in the region had in place a national biodiversity strategy and action plan (NBSAP) and a number of policies and regulatory frameworks had been developed at the national, subregional and continental levels. These included regional policy frameworks such as the NEPAD Action Plan for the Environment Initiative² and the African Strategy on Combating Illegal Exploitation and Illegal Trade in Wild Fauna and Flora in Africa.³

10. It was further noted that the existence of national focal points for the Convention and its Protocols, National Biodiversity Committees and subregional coordination and cooperation frameworks, such as the regional economic communities, would provide effective institutional mechanisms to support the implementation of the post-2020 framework.

11. Furthermore, participants noted several opportunities related to the ongoing efforts in some countries to mainstream biodiversity into national budgets, natural capital accounts, small and medium-sized enterprises (private sector) and into the curriculums of academic institutions.

12. Other opportunities included the existence of financing mechanisms for biodiversity, such as the Global Environment Facility and the Green Climate Fund, as well as the Biodiversity Finance Initiative (BIOFIN), which had enabled Parties to better understand biodiversity finance opportunities.

1. Challenges

13. Participants noted that Africa as a region also faced many challenges. The main challenges include the following:

(a) Limited awareness of the value of biodiversity: a number of stakeholders, including policy and decision makers and the general public, lacks full understanding and recognition of the true value of biodiversity and ecosystem services. There is insufficient communication and reporting of the importance of biodiversity. There is a need to communicate scientific information about the status of biodiversity in language that politicians, policymakers and the general public can understand, and language that inspires people to take action;

(b) Biodiversity loss accelerated by other sectors: A number of sectors, including oil and gas, mining, infrastructure development, agriculture, have direct negative impacts on biodiversity. There is a

¹ <https://au.int/en/agenda2063/>

² <http://www.nepad.org/publication/action-plan-environment-initiative-0>

³ <https://au.int/en/documents/20180207/au-wildlife-strategy>

need to find ways of prevailing upon other ministries, agencies and companies responsible for those sectors to address the effects or potential impacts of their plans, policies and programmes on biodiversity. In this regard, the development and implementation of the post-2020 framework needs the full involvement of all relevant sectors and segments of society;

(c) Participation of young people is lacking: There is a need to give youth opportunities to play a key role in national implementation and participate in relevant policy processes and trainings at the national, regional and global levels;

(d) Limited access to data and knowledge: Reliable data and information are needed to perform some tasks, such as land use planning, valuation of ecosystems and awareness-raising. Many countries do not have good data management systems for reporting purposes;

(e) Limited access to relevant technologies: There is a need for cooperation between countries and regions to facilitate the transfer and sharing of scientific knowledge and innovations;

(f) Unrealistic plans and targets: A number of NBSAPs were too ambitious. Parties need to be realistic in setting their targets, and the targets must be measurable;

(g) Delays in implementation: There was a time lag between the time when Parties agreed on what to do and the time when the implementation or action happened. For example, the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020 and the Aichi Biodiversity Targets were adopted in 2010, but Parties had not implemented most of them and enabling environments had not been created. This was exacerbated by the fact that indicators were agreed almost five years after the Strategic Plan was adopted. Furthermore, there was a time lag between the development of NBSAPs and the actual start of their implementation;

(h) Competition with other priorities: It was challenging to get politicians and decision makers to prioritize biodiversity conservation and its sustainable use over other issues such as food insecurity, unemployment, health and infrastructure;

(i) Poor coordination between ministries and sectors: There was a need for coordination and alignment of the work of various ministries and agencies to deliver biodiversity goals and targets effectively.

14. Other challenges included inadequate capacity and expertise at various levels, limited financial resources, lack of policy and legal coherence at the national level, bad governance and corruption, ineffective institutional frameworks and lack of political will to enforce and support the implementation of NBSAPs.

B. Visioning the world we want

15. Participants identified a number of actions and possible pathways towards realizing the 2050 vision of “living in harmony with nature”. They agreed that the current trends regarding biodiversity were alarming and that business as usual was not an option. They also stated that ambition was required to achieve the future we want; noting that the post-2020 framework would not make a big difference if we set ourselves short. They further noted the need to start acting right away rather than wait until 2050. In this regard, the following ideas were expressed:

(a) *Theory of change*: there is need to develop a clear theory of change for the Convention based on concrete outcomes for the 2050 vision. Focus on access and benefit-sharing and the incorporation of indigenous peoples and their traditional knowledge to experience real transformation in society. Use existing agreements, such as the Sustainable Development Goals and African Union 2063 Agenda, to develop sustainable biodiversity objectives;

(b) *Communication strategy*: an action-oriented communication strategy, adapted to different target audiences is needed. It should include clear communication objectives and core messages. As well, a working group on communication and outreach may be needed to improve communication with decision makers and parliamentarians and other policymakers;

(c) *Stakeholder participation and engagement*: processes and mechanisms should be established at the national, subregional and regional levels to allow inputs from indigenous peoples and local communities and grass-roots environmental non-governmental organizations from the bottom up;

(d) *Generational succession*: youth need to be empowered as they will be the ones in charge in 2050. They should be capacitated (e.g. through mentorships and trainings) and encouraged to share their innovative ideas regarding the world they would want in 2050. Collaboration with relevant youth organizations should be improved;

(e) *New financial architecture*: a global fund for biodiversity and biodiversity financing group (consisting of the CBD Secretariat, World Bank, International Monetary Fund, World Economic Forum, Global Environment Facility (GEF), regional development banks and the private sector) should be established. In addition, national funds need to be allocated to biodiversity and additional resources leveraged from bilateral and multilateral development assistance partners (e.g. AfDB, ADB, IFC, EIB, KfW). Support from GEF should not largely focus on conservation but equitably support the other two objectives of the Convention, i.e. sustainable use and the fair and equitable sharing of benefits. Sustainable funding flows and non-grant instruments for sectoral transformation should also be encouraged to support implementation;

(f) *Technology and nature-based solutions*: Parties and stakeholders should embrace and influence technology and build trust for benefit-sharing. They should also raise awareness of nature-based solutions as alternatives to technology solutions and take advantage of scientific advancements and technological innovations;

(g) *Justice*: legal actions relating to the right to a clean and healthy environment should be included in the post-2020 framework. As well, an international legal body (penal court) should be established or designated to oversee crimes against nature and biodiversity;

(h) *Accountability*: name and shame largest exploiters — target investors and exploiters;

(i) *Role of national focal points*: the role of national focal points in the process should be defined and facilitated;

(j) *Support mechanisms*: a regional database of experts working on biodiversity-related issues should be established to serve as resource for Parties to find the necessary expertise in a timely manner.

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

16. The following is a summary of the views and suggestions that participants expressed during the discussions regarding the possible scope and content of the different elements of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework and the 2050 vision. The issues were grouped and discussed under the following categories:

- (a) Structure of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework and biodiversity targets;
- (b) Integration of issues related to the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety and the Nagoya Protocol on Access and Benefit-Sharing into the post-2020 global biodiversity framework;
- (c) Mainstreaming of biodiversity into relevant sectors and across society and economies at large, and relationship with other relevant processes;
- (d) Resource mobilization and voluntary commitments and contributions;
- (e) Capacity-building, technical and scientific cooperation and knowledge management;
- (f) Communication and outreach;
- (g) Integrating diverse perspectives and gender considerations;
- (h) National implementation, NBSAPs, review processes and mechanisms for accountability.

1. *Structure of the framework*

17. Participants noted that, although the current Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020 has elements that could be revised and built upon, no radical change is needed. However, there is need to evaluate what has worked and what has not worked and identify necessary improvements for better implementation and impact. It is also important to review the strategic plans of other multilateral environmental agreements and identify lessons on what has worked best.

18. *Structure:* The post-2020 global biodiversity framework needs to be well-structured, strategic and specific and should avoid becoming too generalized. The Sustainable Development Goals framework, which includes 17 headline goals, each with specific targets, could provide a useful reference point and example for guiding the structure and presentation of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework. The Sustainable Development Goals are presented in a systematic way, using simplified language that makes it easy to communicate to the public.

19. *Goals and targets:* Participants noted that there is no clear logical connection between the vision, goals and targets of the current Strategic Plan. Also, a number of targets are unclear – some are phrased as objectives while others are phrased as means of implementation. In this regard, participants made the following observations and suggestions:

(a) The strategic goals and targets need to be revised or further developed (i.e. simplified, re-phrased and merged where possible), to make them clearer, more coherent and ambitious and reflective of new realities and developments;

(b) New goals need to be defined, and current ones revised, on the basis of a SWOT (Strengths, Weaknesses, Opportunities and Threats) analysis;

(c) The new targets and the revised ones should be:

(i) “SMARTer” (Specific, Measurable, Attainable, Relevant and Time-bound), concrete and easy to communicate to decision makers, the people and practitioners working on the ground;

(ii) Ambitious (i.e. beyond business as usual) but tempered by realism, including the availability of the time and resources required to achieve them;

(iii) Evidence-based, drawing on relevant scientific studies and assessment reports, such as the global and regional assessments on biodiversity and ecosystem services undertaken by the Intergovernmental Science-Policy Platform on Biodiversity and Ecosystem Services (IPBES) and the *State of the World's Biodiversity for Food and Agriculture* by the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO);

(iv) Based on what is needed to achieve the desired state of biodiversity (or determine the direction and level of change in the status of biodiversity) and on the drivers and response measures;

(v) Guided by the principles of ease of implementation and achievement of measurable impact;

(d) Sub-targets with clear measurable indicators, such as those of the Sustainable Development Goals, would be useful;

(e) Key requirements of the three objectives of the Convention should be carefully considered and adequately captured in the design of the goals and targets;

(f) The wording of the goals and targets should be mindful of biodiversity initiatives that already have targets and capture the 2030 Agenda and the Sustainable Development Goals.

20. *Indicators*: At the time of its adoption, the current Strategic Plan did not include indicators for monitoring and evaluation. These were developed several years later. The post-2020 framework should include clear measurable indicators. Indicators used in relevant strategies (including for the Sustainable Development Goals and biodiversity-related multilateral environmental agreements) should be reviewed and incorporated, as necessary, or aligned to highlight the linkages. However, caution should be taken not to undermine the biodiversity goals and ambition.

21. *Elements of the vision*: Participants suggested that the four key elements of the 2050 vision, i.e. “value, conserve, restore and wisely use” biodiversity, could be reflected in the post-2020 global biodiversity framework in the following ways:

(a) Incorporate them as separate strategies, each with a detailed action plan, to guide action towards the attainment of the vision;

(b) Build the goals of the post-2020 framework around the four elements and present them in a way that can be easily communicated; or

(c) Integrate them throughout the structure of the framework, at all levels and in a balanced manner, to help ensure they well captured and addressed.

22. *Cross-cutting issues*: There were two radically different views regarding how to address cross-cutting issues (such as gender, traditional knowledge, biosafety, access and benefit-sharing and others) in the post-2020 global biodiversity framework. Some participants felt that these should be reflected through the entire document with clear language in the targets and not just be consigned to one section of the document. Others suggested that these should have a separate section supported by a clear programme of work or action plan.

23. *Means implementation*: The post-2020 global biodiversity framework should include clear means of implementation and enforcement and should identify who would be responsible for ensuring its implementation.

2. *Integration of issues related to the Protocols*

24. Participants underlined the need for the post-2020 framework to address the three objectives of the Convention in a balanced manner and with equal emphasis. They also noted that the Nagoya Protocol on access and benefit-sharing, the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety, and the Nagoya – Kuala Lumpur Supplementary Protocol on Liability and Redress, are separate legal instruments supporting the objectives of the Convention. Thus, the post-2020 framework should integrate issues relating to the Protocols at a strategic level.

25. *ABS and Nagoya Protocol*: Participants suggested that the integration of ABS in the post-2020 framework needs to be broader than the Nagoya Protocol, noting that ABS is the third objective of the Convention and there are obligations under Article 15 of the Convention. Also, links should be established to other processes and mechanisms dealing with ABS, such as those under the International Treaty on Plant Genetic Resources for Food and Agriculture and the World Health Organization (WHO).

26. *Contribution of the Protocols to the Sustainable Development Goals*: The Protocols include important elements that complement and contribute to the achievement of the Sustainable Development Goals. For example, the implementation of Nagoya Protocol can contribute to the delivery of Sustainable Development Goals relating to food security, health and poverty alleviation. Therefore, there is a need to strengthen the linkage between the Protocols, the post-2020 framework and the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development and the Sustainable Development Goals.

27. *Implementation plans for the Protocols*: It was noted that, while the Protocols have cross-cutting elements that can be integrated into the post-2020 framework there are specific elements of each Protocol that are unique and would require their own enabling mechanisms. In this regard, some participants highlighted the need to develop stand-alone strategic plans for the protocols with prioritized resource requirements and cross-cutting indicators, linked to the post-2020 framework. Participants recalled that the

Parties to the Cartagena Protocol had adopted a process that would result in a specific implementation plan for the Protocol to be anchored in and complementary to the post-2020 global biodiversity framework.⁴ However, there is a need to undertake a proper assessment of the current Strategic Plan for the Protocol, which expires in 2020, to guide the post-2020 process.

28. A number of participants suggested that an implementation plan may also need to be developed for the Nagoya Protocol after the adoption of the post-2020 framework. A few others were of the view that ABS should be incorporated in the post-2020 framework as a cross-cutting element at different levels, including in the mission, goals, objectives, targets and indicators, as appropriate, and not only as a simple target. The current Aichi Biodiversity Target 16 should be revised and made more ambitious to support implementation of ABS.

29. *Means of implementation for the Protocols:* Participants suggested that the means of implementation proposed in the post-2020 framework for the Convention should also serve as the means of implementation for the Protocols.

30. *Emerging issues relating to the Protocols:* Participants noted that while discussions on a number of new emerging issues and technologies relating to the Protocols, such as digital sequence information on genetic resources, global multilateral benefit-sharing mechanism and synthetic biology, will not be concluded prior to the adoption of the post-2020 framework, it is necessary to include flexibility in the framework so that they can be addressed during the post-2020 period.

2. Mainstreaming

31. Participants emphasized the need to effectively address the issue of mainstreaming biodiversity across relevant sectors and segments of society in the post-2020 global biodiversity framework. To do so effectively, it is important to clarify what exactly is meant by mainstreaming, why it is necessary and how it can be done. Some participants wondered whether mainstreaming is about taking biodiversity considerations into other sectors or bringing other sector issues into the biodiversity work. It was noted that mainstreaming is multi-faceted, and that process indicators and output indicators are needed to monitor progress in the mainstreaming processes.

32. *Mainstreaming challenges:* Participants noted that mainstreaming has been a challenge. There is limited integration and mainstreaming in global processes and national-level implementation. Some of the reasons noted during the discussions were the following:

(a) Lack of understanding or due recognition of the true value of biodiversity and ecosystem services by various sectors. In this regard, participants highlighted the need to go beyond mainstreaming to raising awareness and demonstrating the value and importance of biodiversity to other sectors. It was noted that natural capital accounting tools would be very helpful in these efforts;

(b) Lack of political will and commitment. Biodiversity is often not considered a priority by decision makers at various levels, subnational, national, regional and international levels. We need to urgently reach out and clearly articulate to decision makers why biodiversity and the environment should be a priority so that they can encourage and support its integration into relevant sectoral or cross-sectoral plans, policies, projects and programmes, action plans and projects;

(c) The work of the Convention on Biological Diversity and other conventions is not well harmonized at the national level. For example, some participants noted that, during the preparations for meetings of the Conference of the Parties, the ministries responsible for different aspects of the Convention come together to prepare, but afterwards they all retreat into their silos. There should be a coordination office to harmonize action among ministries and agencies dealing with various conventions;

(d) Biodiversity issues are not well considered in strategic impact assessments (SEAs) and environmental impact assessments.

⁴ Decision 9/7: <https://www.cbd.int/decisions/mop/?m=cp-mop-09>.

33. *Mainstreaming strategies*: Participants identified possible strategies for promoting biodiversity mainstreaming. These included the following:

(a) Ministries and national agencies responsible for biodiversity should prepare information packages to help other sectors understand how to include biodiversity issues in their frameworks. The packages should outline what is needed and what opportunities and benefits exist. This includes making a business case for biodiversity;

(b) Biodiversity experts from relevant ministries should be involved in national budgeting processes to ensure allocation of funding for biodiversity;

(c) Biodiversity experts should also proactively engage in the national planning processes to ensure that biodiversity is appropriately reflected in the national economic blueprints;

(d) The ministries of finance and all relevant sectors should be engaged in development and implementation of NBSAPs;

(e) Sector reports, policies and plans should include components on biodiversity;

(f) Climate strategies and action plans should include biodiversity aspects and should be prepared together with the active involvement of biodiversity practitioners;

(g) Land use and physical planning should take into consideration biodiversity issues such as conservation areas and environmentally significant areas;

(h) Various government departments should be obliged to consider biodiversity in SEA and EIA processes in order to mainstream the conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity very early in the process. In addition, it was proposed that measures should be taken to address potential conflicts of interest in the development of EIA reports, which could undermine efforts to mainstream biodiversity. Such measures could include the use of commissions comprising interdisciplinary expertise to conduct EIAs.

34. *Strengthening linkages with other multilateral environmental agreements*: Participants noted the need to continue engaging and using relevant multilateral environmental agreements, processes and agendas, such as the Sustainable Development Goals and the Paris Agreement, to point policymakers to areas where they can take action to mainstream biodiversity. They also highlighted the need to strengthen linkages and synergies with the Sustainable Development Goals and multilateral environmental agreements in national level implementation and at the international level and foster collaboration between the secretariats of multilateral environmental agreements.

4. *Resource mobilization*

35. The post-2020 global biodiversity framework needs to consider funding issues from the onset. It needs to be designed to enable resource mobilization, innovative financing, new partnerships and more active engagement from the private sector. The framework should be costed and should include a prioritized plan with targets and timeframes.

36. *National ownership*: To increase national ownership of the post-2020 global framework, Parties need to allocate adequate domestic budgets towards biodiversity conservation and its sustainable use, taking into account the national biodiversity targets and the identified the financing gaps.

37. *Biodiversity fund*: There is a need to create a dedicated global biodiversity fund. Contributions to this fund could be based on gross domestic product (GDP). The fund would complement and leverage the resources provided by existing financial mechanisms, such as the Global Environment Facility (GEF) and the Green Climate Fund.

38. *The Global Environment Facility as the main funding mechanism*: The GEF system for transparent allocation of resources (STAR) needs to better reflect biodiversity conservation needs. Linkages between the STAR and NBSAPs need to be strengthened and aligned, and, in this regard, GEF council members and operational focal points need to better coordinate with CBD national focal points. There is a need for

more transparency around the decision-making body of the GEF Secretariat, as well as at the national level on project prioritization for funding. Reduction of complexity, bureaucracy and increased acceleration of administrative processes is urgently needed.

39. *Innovative financing mechanisms*: Ministries of Finance need to be more actively engaged in the process as they need to understand and appreciate the value of biodiversity. Capacity-building for resource mobilization and absorption would also be useful, especially in terms of enabling innovative financing mechanisms. Taxes, debt swapping, green bonds and other innovative financing mechanisms could be used at the national level to facilitate resource mobilization.

40. *Upscale existing financing*: There is a need to upscale and replicate mechanisms such as BIOFIN to enable countries to measure their current biodiversity expenditures, assess their financial needs and explore and broaden biodiversity financing solutions and investments. More exchanges on good practices and learning between countries should be encouraged. Biodiversity issues need to be mainstreamed into climate-related commitments and financing mechanisms, such as Green Climate Fund. Similarly, it is important to emphasize that nature-based investments can provide revenue and financial profit (payments for ecosystem services) while avoiding further loss of biodiversity.

41. *Private sector*: There is need to engage the private sector to hold business and industry more accountable, encourage them to contribute to national biodiversity financing, and to ensure their compliance with corporate social responsibility (CSR) requirements.

5. *Capacity-building*

42. Participants identified capacity-building as one of the critical means of implementation that will determine the success or failure of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework. They noted that most Parties in Africa lack adequate capacity at the individual, institutional and systemic levels to implement the Convention and its Protocols effectively and it is partly the reason why they have been unable to meet most of the Aichi Biodiversity Targets.

43. Participants discussed the status of capacity-building in the region over the last 10 years and noted the following major weaknesses and challenges that need to be considered and addressed during the development of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework and the proposed long-term strategic framework for capacity-building beyond 2020:

(a) *Lack of common understanding of the meaning and scope of capacity-building*: Several participants noted that there are varying views regarding the meaning of capacity-building. Sometimes it is simply equated to training. Multiple definitions and disparities in understanding of the term capacity-building cause confusion among donors, capacity-building providers and recipients;

(b) *Lack of strategic guidance*: It was noted that the Conference of the Parties adopted a short-term action plan for capacity-building in 2016, more than six years after the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020 was launched. For a long time, the convention lacked a guiding framework to provide strategic direction and foster a comprehensive and coherent approach to capacity-building;

(c) *Lack of country ownership*: It was noted that a number of capacity-building initiatives in the region are donor-driven and not fully owned by the concerned government agencies and target audiences. In some cases, the responsible government agencies provide endorsements for the initiatives but are not fully involved in determining the scope of those initiatives. Consequently, some initiatives do not reflect the priorities, interests and wishes of Governments and of a broad range of stakeholders. In some cases, capacity-building actions are determined by the donor funding available. Governments use the funds earmarked for capacity-building without a defined strategy, assessed need or clear desired outcomes;

(d) *Gaps in thematic coverage*: A number of thematic areas under the Convention and its Protocols were still not well covered by capacity-building initiatives and require due attention. For example, technical capacity is required for thematic areas, such as socioeconomic impacts of living modified organisms and access and benefit-sharing (especially the access permit processes), and for

functional capacities, such as institutional capacity-building, project development, resource mobilization, communications and national reporting;

(e) *Imbalance in regional coverage*: It was noted that capacity-building initiatives are not equitably distributed in the region. For example, it was mentioned that West Africa lagged behind in terms of coverage of biodiversity capacity-building projects and learning opportunities;

(f) *Lack of systematic needs assessment and stock-taking*: It was noted that capacity-building interventions are not always based on the expressed needs of Parties or other target audiences and do not take stock of, build on or utilize existing capacities. While some needs assessments and stocktaking exercises are carried out during the design of specific projects and activities (such as training courses), such assessments are generally not systematized and analysed at the organizational or systemic level;

(g) *Lack of baselines and indicators to measure impact*: Participants noted that, currently, there are no established baselines or benchmarks that can be used to monitor progress effectively and measure the results and impact of capacity-building interventions and investments at the national and global levels. This had made it difficult to establish and communicate the important contribution of capacity-building efforts to decision makers and donors;

(h) *Short-term interventions*: Participants noted that many capacity-building initiatives are generally short-term in nature. They emphasized the need to promote long-term programmes, recognizing that capacity-building is generally a long-term endeavour whose impact cannot be realized within short time frames;

(i) *Poor targeting of capacity-building interventions*: It was noted that capacity-building initiatives were often not well targeted. This had led to situations where the same persons are selected for most of the trainings offered, or the wrong participants being chosen to attend capacity-building activities for which they are not qualified or not related to their work. It was also noted that there was limited focus on training young professionals. The participants highlighted the need for careful and strategic selection of participants. It was observed that the current process of selection of participants for capacity-building activities organized under the Convention is ad hoc and reliant on nominations from the national focal points. As it stands, the process is not effective in ensuring that the right persons are targeted;

(j) *Limited expertise and high staff turnover*: Participants noted that many countries in Africa lacked experts in various fields. This problem is compounded by frequent skills drain due to the high turnover of personnel trained under CBD-related capacity-building initiatives. Some of the suggested solutions to this problem included institutionalizing coaching, mentoring and other on-job training, promotion of training-of-trainers programmes, provision of staff incentives and career development opportunities, and establishment of programmes for supporting young professionals;

(k) *Limited focus on institutional and systemic level capacity-building*: Participants noted that, over the years, there had been too much focus on developing capacity at the individual level (mostly through training workshops) and limited focus at the institutional and systemic levels. Also, there had been too much emphasis on developing technical capacities and less attention to functional capacities, such as project design and management, resource mobilization and communication;

(l) *Lack of sustainability*: Participants noted that many capacity-building initiatives had not led to sustainable outcomes and lasting solutions. Long-term sustainability of capacity-building programmes is critical to creating lasting change after the end of the specific interventions;

(m) Other major limitations and constraints identified were: limited resource availability for capacity-building, mis-allocation and sometimes wastage of financial resources, limited attention to biodiversity in formal education programmes (including at the masters and doctoral levels), too much dependence on external consultants to deliver capacity-building and ineffective use of capacities and existing opportunities (including expertise, tools and centres of excellence) within the region.

44. Some of the solutions suggested to address the above limitations and challenges and to improve capacity-building in order to support the implementation of the post-2020 framework effectively were the following:

(a) Develop a shared working definition of capacity-building and develop a common understanding of the meaning and scope of capacity-building in the context of the post-2020 framework to, inter alia, help improve communication between actors;

(b) Broaden the scope of capacity-building beyond training to address all three dimensions (individual, institutional and systemic/enabling environment), recognizing that capacity-building is an integrated and long-term process;

(c) For capacity-building initiatives, always clarify what capacity and whose capacity is to be built and by whom, and describe the theory of change, i.e. the logical linkage between the capacity-building actions and outputs and their contribution to the desired outcomes and ultimately to the substantive impacts in terms of halting biodiversity loss and living in harmony with nature;

(d) Undertake participatory capacity needs assessments and inventories of existing capacities and opportunities prior to developing and implementing capacity-building interventions. Wherever possible, analyse the needs already identified in the NBSAPs and ensure the needs expressed by Parties and stakeholders are being met by having extensive communication between capacity-building providers and national implementing agencies and organizations; ensure that capacity-building interventions target the most urgent priority needs;

(e) Based on needs assessments, develop capacity-building strategies and action plans outlining, among other things, the capacity-building targets and indicators, the timelines and the tools and approaches to be used;

(f) Design and implement capacity-building that reflect and respond to the identified needs and priorities of Parties and stakeholders;

(g) Adopt a holistic approach: capacity-building initiatives often address a range of different thematic and cross-cutting issues and involve a multitude of tasks and activities. It is therefore crucial to adopt a holistic (rather than a piecemeal or ad hoc) approach to capacity-building to ensure effective and sustainable outcomes;

(h) Undertake rigorous monitoring, evaluation, and reporting: Participants recommended that a monitoring and evaluation framework and guidelines should be developed to assist Parties to establish baselines and to measure the performance and impact of capacity-building initiatives in support of the post-2020 framework. They also highlighted the need to identify from the design stage common indicators to be used to evaluate capacity-building interventions and to document and disseminate evidence gathered using these indicators;

(i) Assess and communicate the impact of capacity-building: Participants underlined the need to systematically assess and communicate the impact of capacity-building initiatives, document and share success stories and lessons learned, and to ensure maximum utilization of the best practices and lessons learned in the development of new capacity-building initiatives;

(j) Ensure the sustainability of capacity-building initiatives: Participants emphasized the need to ensure all capacity-building projects and programmes incorporate effective follow-up measures to maintain and/or upscale the resulting outputs and outcomes after the end of the project and focus on long-term rather than short-term solutions. Such measures could include ensuring full country ownership of the projects, institutionalizing capacity-building activities into existing structures and functions, and building networks and long-term partnerships with relevant institutions, such as local universities.

45. In summary, participants emphasized the need to adopt a strategic and practical approach to ensure that capacity-building contributes meaningfully to the effective implementation of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework.

6. *Technical and scientific cooperation and technology transfer*

46. Participants noted that limited progress had been made in promoting technical and scientific cooperation, technology transfer and innovation. While some initiatives and programmes, such as the Bio-Bridge Initiative, had been established, they were underfunded and only a few Parties had benefited.

47. Participants underlined the need to enhance technical and scientific cooperation, technology transfer and innovation as key means of implementation for supporting the post-2020 framework. They identified the following as possible actions for consideration:

(a) Mapping and cataloguing existing providers or potential providers of technical assistance that could be matched with those requesting assistance;

(b) Assessment/inventory of relevant technologies and best practices (including traditional knowledge and science) to identify what exists where and who owns it so that national biodiversity policymakers and practitioners can devise mechanisms for accessing them and/or respond to the gaps and challenges encountered in accessing them;

(c) Technology fit for purpose: Review examples of technologies that have been transferred over the last decade to understand the objectives and purpose of the transfer with a view to adopting strategies and decisions designed to provide the most fit-for-purpose outcomes;

(d) Promote and support the development of technologies locally rather than focusing on transfer from other countries, which is sometimes constrained by issues related to intellectual property rights and lack of spare parts in case of equipment. Participants noted that it is best to have home-grown technologies and know-how to ensure sustainability and reduce dependence and costs, and highlighted the need to focus on soft technologies, practices and know-how;

(e) Promote development, transfer and use of indigenous and traditional technologies, including through existing traditional exchange mechanisms and systems among indigenous peoples and local communities;

(f) Build accelerator mechanisms at the local and national levels to encourage and promote the development of technologies, innovations and solutions for the conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity in support of various components of the post-2020 framework. Such mechanisms would provide platforms for people to analyse technical challenges, discuss new ideas, undertake feasibility and sustainability studies, and leverage existing opportunities to collaborate on start-ups and accelerate deployment promising innovations and solutions;

(g) Identify and strengthen centers of excellence in the region (for example those with advanced laboratories) for reference on technologies, practices and develop a network of such centres in Africa;

(h) Refine and include Aichi Biodiversity Target 19 in the post-2020 global biodiversity framework;

(i) Develop partnerships and exchange programmes between countries to be facilitated by technical partners and brokers (such as academia, United Nations agencies and the private sector), including through technical training, local knowledge transfer and sharing of equipment and expertise between institutions and countries.

7. *Knowledge management*

48. Participants noted that knowledge was an important asset and that knowledge management would be crucial in the implementation of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework. In this regard, they highlighted the need to identify the type of knowledge that would be required, where it would be sourced from and who would need it and why, and how they would access it.

49. It was observed that a lot of data, information and knowledge existed, but were scattered in various institutions and not easily accessible in the right format or language. For example, many researchers and students collect useful data and information, but there were no effective national systems for mobilizing such information and making it easily available to support planning, policy and decision-making processes. It was reported, however, that sometimes researchers do not share their findings or provide feedback to the government or providers of the information at the end of their research. Participants further noted that the culture of data and information-sharing was lacking in many countries, observing that many institutions were reluctant or unwilling to share information among themselves.

50. Participants also noted the need to further strengthen the clearing-house mechanism, including assisting all countries to establish or enhance national clearing-house mechanisms (CHMs) to facilitate the exchange of information among Parties. It was observed that the process of establishing national CHMs had been slow and that many Parties still faced technological challenges (including limited access to the Internet) to access and use the central CHM effectively. Some participants observed that the CHM was designed for the urbanized society with access to computers and the Internet and is not suitable for stakeholders in non-urban areas, including field practitioners, indigenous peoples and local communities, farmers and the rural public. It was further noted that many countries lacked expertise and know-how to access, manage, share and utilize the information in the CHM effectively. As a result, the tools developed under the CHM were being fully utilized by only a few persons at the national and subnational levels and information available in the CHM was under-utilized.

51. Some participants also highlighted the issue of quality of data and information shared through the CHM and other mechanisms. It was noted that a number of countries lacked mechanisms for verification of the quality of the data generated and made available. A lack of appropriate and data-sharing protocols and standards was also identified as one of the challenges faced by some Parties and various institutions.

52. Participants also discussed the issue of “big data”. It was observed that the new era of “big data” was both an opportunity and a challenge for Parties and partners. It was considered a challenge because it raised questions of ownership of the data and their management (e.g. who would own the data, manage it and use the resulting products?). It was also an opportunity because Parties would access large quantities of data and images at the largest possible scale.

53. Finally, participants noted that data was not information and that information was not knowledge. They therefore highlighted the need for deliberate efforts at the country level to collect, compile and analyse available data to generate relevant information that can be used by planners and policymakers. They also highlighted the need to further process and aggregate information into knowledge, for example in the form of good practices and lessons learned, and in a format and language that can be understood by various end users, including policy- and decision makers, practitioners and the public.

54. Some of the suggestions made to address the above challenges and improve the creation, access to, management, sharing and use of knowledge in support of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework included the following:

General suggestions

(a) Develop national systems for discovering, mapping and mobilizing existing information and making it easily available to support national planning and policy- and decision-making processes;

(b) Put in place national legislation, administrative frameworks and incentives to encourage knowledge sharing;

(c) Institutionalize knowledge management to nurture a strong culture of knowledge sharing and establish policies and procedures to ensure knowledge capture and retention when national focal points and other staff retire or move on;

(d) Develop infrastructure and national capacity for data collection, management and exchange;

(e) Take advantage of the latest information communication technologies to establish dedicated, dynamic and user-friendly platforms to facilitate easy and rapid exchange of available information;

(f) Complement existing databases at the global level with national and regional databases, tailored to the specific needs of Parties and ensure that those databases are up to date and well maintained;

(g) Apart from Internet-based systems, explore different knowledge-sharing tools, such as radios, farmer or field schools and mobile phones, to reach various audiences at different levels.

Clearing-house mechanism

(h) Further develop and strengthen the central CHM and the national CHMs for enhanced exchange of information at the national, regional and global levels and ensure that they are consistently updated and available with no downtime;

(i) Establish data-sharing protocols and standards to enable interoperability with various regional and international knowledge management systems and databases;

(j) Make the CHM more visible to various audiences (beyond the national focal points) to encourage them to access and use it. As well, Parties should designate, train and authorize more national users to contribute information to the CHM;

(k) Identify innovative ways to encourage the use of the CHM, including the development of applications (Apps) to facilitate easy and timely access to information available in the CHM;

Quality of information and knowledge

(l) Establish mechanisms for verification of the quality of data and information shared;

Use of the knowledge

(m) Encourage and support the capture, compilation, analysis and sharing of best practices and lessons learned in a format that can be easily accessed and used;

(n) Organize, structure and package the data, information, tools and knowledge available by themes and target audiences to facilitate their access in a user-friendly and fit-for-purpose manner.

8. *Communication and outreach*

55. Participants discussed a number of issues related to communication and outreach, including how the post-2020 global biodiversity framework should address communication and awareness raising issues to facilitate transformational change and the realisation of the 2050 vision of living in harmony with nature. The following is a summary of the main suggestions made:

(a) *Education and public awareness*: more emphasis should be placed on education and public awareness. The objectives and target audiences should be defined before the appropriate communication tool and language (terminology) are selected. This entails breaking communication into various components, such as political communication versus mass communication. It is important for communications to also engage those often seen as adversaries;

(b) *National communication strategies*: there is a need to develop national communication strategies related to the post-2020 global biodiversity framework. The strategies should include clear, catchy and consistent messages based on research and science. The messages need to resonate and connect to people's realities and focus on solutions and concrete actions. Everybody needs to be a communicator and can take part in communicating;

(c) *Communication campaigns*: communication campaigns and resources cannot be exclusively online. The Internet and social media are great tools, but they exclude women, youth, rural communities and other marginalized groups. Diverse methods of communication, such as radio or printed

materials, need to be used, and grass-roots organizations and civil society need be involved in the delivery of key messages to local communities;

(d) *Formal engagement with the media*: there is no ongoing formal engagement with the media. It only happens on an ad hoc basis on the side lines at major events. Journalists need to be encouraged and trained on how to cover and promote biodiversity issues. It was suggested that, as an incentive, a recognition award be offered to journalists covering biodiversity issues;

(e) *Communication focal points*: there is a need to designate national communication focal points and a dedicated clearing-house mechanism for communications as a way of reducing the disconnection between CBD national focal points and communication experts;

(f) *Harnessing culture*: communications should tap into culture and tradition to make messages more salient. For instance, many African cultures have venerated totems or proverbs, many of which relate directly to biodiversity. Cultural and religious leaders are very influential and can serve as champions for biodiversity;

(g) *Communicating in the African context*: biodiversity and nature conservation must be made relevant to the African context. Communications can help to show how African countries can use biodiversity to address challenges they face. Narratives should be crafted that resonate with Africans, and the perception that conservation messages are externally imposed must be addressed;

(h) *Behavioural change communication*: there is a need to explore the possibility of employing behavioural change communication strategies to convey a sense of urgency for biodiversity action. Messages should underscore the momentousness of the fifteenth meeting of the Conference of the Parties and the need create an enabling environment ahead of the next meeting of the Conference of the Parties;

(i) *Assessment and evaluation*: appropriate methods and/or tools are needed to establish whether communications campaigns have produced the desired results. This would allow for lessons to be drawn and analyses to be conducted for the purpose of building on past successes and failures.

9. *Integrating diverse perspectives*

56. There was general recognition of the need to consider the diverse perspectives and contributions of various stakeholders, including indigenous peoples and local communities, women, youth, academic and research community and private sector, in the preparation and eventual implementation of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework. All participants agreed that the development of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework needed to be inclusive and responsive to the views, perspectives, interests and concerns of different stakeholders.

57. Participants noted that indigenous peoples and local communities were the best custodians of biodiversity and ecosystems as their lives were inextricably linked to nature, and nature had become part of their traditional knowledge, customary laws and practices. They also noted that women often worked closely with nature and influenced the actions of the young people.

58. The role of the business sector was also highlighted. It was noted that this stakeholder group had significant influence and could help to promote sustainable policies, practices and technologies that would potentially contribute to ensuring the sustainable use of biodiversity.

59. Participants proposed the following specific actions to facilitate stakeholder engagement in the development and implementation of the framework, noting that various stakeholder groups need to be involved right from beginning and on a continuing basis, even though this would require a significant amount of resources:

(a) *Stakeholder mapping*: identify stakeholder groups from various social sectors, establish their needs and identify and acknowledge their roles in the conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity;

(b) *Consultative platforms*: develop tools (such as virtual platforms or collaborative networks) to provide dedicated spaces for different stakeholders to interact and share experiences and opinions within their own group or across different groups;

(c) *Community-to-community exchanges*: encourage and facilitate indigenous peoples and local communities and community groups to share experiences, views, and perspectives through existing traditional mechanisms and communicate these the broader processes, such as the national consultations, the Open-ended Working Group on the Post-2020 Global Biodiversity Framework and the Subsidiary Body on Implementation;

(d) *Awareness raising*: organize knowledge-sharing and awareness-raising activities to enhance stakeholder engagement process. Stakeholders may not engage meaningfully if they do not know their rights or understand the prevailing issues and the required actions in the context of post-2020 framework;

(e) *Highlight the value of biodiversity*: stakeholder engagement on biodiversity issues needs to be clearly tied to the value of biodiversity and its contribution to livelihoods within stakeholders' own context. For example, through community co-management of protected areas and benefit-sharing arrangements in some African countries, communities clearly recognized the benefits from the protection of the natural assets through socioeconomic development activities supported with revenues from the parks.

60. Finally, participants noted that the Nagoya Protocol on Access and Benefit-sharing and the work related to Article 8(j) provided good examples of how perspectives of indigenous peoples and local communities could be collected and addressed. The Protocol sets out clear rules and procedures on how to ensure informed consent or approval and involvement of indigenous peoples and local communities regarding access to, and sharing of benefits from, their genetic resources and traditional knowledge associated with genetic resources and provides guidance to ensure that all stakeholders involved in the process work together effectively.

10. *Gender considerations*

61. Participants highlighted the need to integrate gender considerations in the post-2020 global biodiversity framework as a cross-cutting issue and to promote gender equality in the implementation of the framework. It was noted that the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020 had not adequately incorporated gender. Gender was simply mentioned under the section on support mechanisms rather than integrated into each and every goal. It was also observed that the CBD Gender Action Plan had not been well publicized or communicated across various groups.

62. Some participants noted that too often the term gender is associated only with women per se and not the whole range of issues relating to socially differentiated expectations, roles and responsibilities in the management of biodiversity between men and women and other issues, such as gender inequalities in terms of rights to resources, access to knowledge and opportunities and inclusiveness in relevant processes. It was thus agreed that more effort was needed to raise awareness about gender and the meaning of being gender-responsive. However, when discussing gender-responsive policy implementation, it was important to be aware of the different systems and capabilities of various countries.

63. Participants also emphasized the need for effective coordination across government departments on the development and implementation of gender action plans. They also called for the collection of baseline data on gender in the context of biodiversity management.

11. *National implementation and national biodiversity strategies and action plans*

64. Participants discussed how the post-2020 framework could influence the development and implementation of NBSAPs, what was required to align NBSAPs with the post-2020 framework, and what elements could be included in the framework to strengthen effectiveness and implementation of NBSAPs.

65. Participants noted that NBSAPs, as the main mechanism for implementing the Convention at the national level, would be crucial for the implementation of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework. They highlighted the need for continued implementation of the revised NBSAPs adopted by Parties over the past few years as most priorities, targets and challenges identified were still valid.

66. The following suggestions were made to facilitate and enhance national implementation:

(a) The post-2020 framework should promote an adaptive approach whereby Parties would revise and align their NBSAPs based on the new and emerging biodiversity issues identified in the post-2020 framework;

(b) The post-2020 framework should emphasize the benefit-sharing component as an incentive for biodiversity conservation and sustainable use. In this regard, the post-2020 framework should include a more comprehensive and stronger target on access and benefit-sharing and NBSAPs should be adapted accordingly to facilitate national implementation of that target;

(c) The plans, programmes and timeframes for national implementation of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework should be harmonized with those for the implementation of the Sustainable Development Goals;

(d) Enabling mechanisms should be established or strengthened to facilitate implementation of NBSAPs and enable Parties to achieve their national targets. For example, the post-2020 framework should include a proposal for the establishment of a dedicated biodiversity fund where pledges and voluntary contributions could be made by countries, organizations and foundations to complement existing financial mechanisms, such as the Global Environment Facility and the Green Climate Fund;

(e) Global partnerships and transboundary collaborative initiatives on cross-border issues regarding biodiversity conservation and sustainable development should be expanded to support and complement national implementation programmes.

12. Voluntary commitments

67. Participants shared views regarding possible forms of voluntary commitments for biodiversity that Parties and non-State actors, including civil society organizations and business, could make and how voluntary commitments could be reflected in the post-2020 global biodiversity framework.

68. There was a general agreement about the need to learn lessons from the nationally determined contributions and voluntary contributions under the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC), to evaluate how well these had worked and to build on their experience and success.

69. It was also suggested that the Secretariat could request to send out a call for Parties to make “nationally determined biodiversity commitments” and for Governments and non-State actors to make voluntary commitments for biodiversity. The commitments could gradually increase in the level of ambition over time.

70. Participants further suggested that the post-2020 global biodiversity framework could include a mechanism to oversee, review and monitor the progress made periodically and make recommendations for improvement. Such a mechanism could be closely linked and harmonized with the biodiversity-related nationally determined contributions under UNFCCC to avoid duplication of efforts. The secretariats of CBD, UNFCCC and the United Nations Convention to Combat Desertification could work together on monitoring the common commitments and prepare joint reports for the respective governing bodies.

13. Review mechanisms

71. Participants briefly discussed mechanisms that would be needed to support the review of implementation of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework and how those mechanisms could be integrated into the framework. They noted that national reports, which are required under the Convention and its two Protocols, would be central to any review mechanism and therefore emphasized the need to ensure that national reporting obligations were enforced.

72. The participants also highlighted the need to streamline and synergize national reporting across all biodiversity-related conventions, the Rio conventions and the monitoring process for the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development in order to reduce reporting burden for Parties.⁵

73. Participants further underlined the need to incorporate indicators in the post-2020 framework and to ensure that those indicators were clear and measurable. They emphasized the need to avoid the previous mistake whereby indicators were agreed almost five years after the strategic plan had been adopted.

14. *Mechanisms for accountability*

74. Participants in general recognized the need to include mechanisms for accountability in the post-2020 global biodiversity framework to make countries more accountable in implementing the Convention and its Protocols. However, they highlighted the need to exercise caution when introducing new concepts and notions, such as “mechanisms for accountability at the national level”, that had not been tested and tried before.

75. There was general agreement regarding the need to consider compliance and accountability jointly. In that regard, it was suggested that the post-2020 framework should encourage mechanisms to enforce national reporting obligations and the implementation of NBSAPs. It was also proposed that an accounting or score card system could be considered to encourage the implementation of NBSAPs.

76. Furthermore, participants suggested the post-2020 framework should encourage submissions from non-State actors on the implementation of NBSAPs. They also suggested that regional and subregional organizations should be empowered by Parties to address accountability issues as one of the potential measures to improve accountability.

77. The need for continued biodiversity mainstreaming into sectoral policies at the national level was also highlighted as important for enhancing accountability of all relevant sectors.

15. *Other issues and suggestions*

78. *Regional cooperation:* Participants emphasized the need to strengthen regional cooperation noting that biodiversity did not recognize borders. They observed that many regional initiatives already existed and could be leveraged to support biodiversity conservation and its sustainable use. Regional platforms, such as the African Ministerial Conference on the Environment (AMCEN), also offered opportunities to coordinate and align policy frameworks, share experiences and lessons, mobilize and maximize use of expertise in the region, and build regional support networks and rosters of biodiversity experts. Participants also highlighted the need to identify existing regional centers of excellence and strategic partners that could become “champions” for regional cooperation.

79. *Integration of human rights:* Participants highlighted the need to include “the right to a healthy environment” as a key component for delivery of the post-2020 framework. This would assist in achieving multiple benefits to society and biodiversity. Human rights conventions and structures are already in place, and their existence could be utilized to advocate for a human right to a healthy environment.

80. *Protection of environmental human rights defenders:* Participants noted that environment had become the new frontline for human rights defenders. They underlined the urgent need to protect and support environmental human rights defenders and recommended that the post-2020 framework should include a support mechanism for environmental human rights defenders.

⁵ The Conference of the Parties, in decision 14/27, emphasized the value of improving the alignment of national reports under the Convention and its Protocols and enhancing synergies with the biodiversity-related conventions and the Rio conventions on national reporting in order to reduce reporting burdens and recognized the potential of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework in facilitating the such alignment. It also requested the Executive Secretary to identify concrete actions to advance synergies on reporting across biodiversity-related conventions and the Rio Conventions (paragraph 3(e)) and to explore synergies with reporting systems and tools for the Sustainable Development Goals, including with regard to methodological approaches (paragraph 3(f)).

III. PROCEEDINGS OF THE CONSULTATION

Item 1. Opening of the consultation and organizational matters

81. The consultation was opened on 2 April 2019 by Mr. Jolly Wasambo, on behalf of Mr. Moussa Mahamat Faki, Chairperson of the African Union Commission. In his remarks, he welcomed the participants to Addis Ababa, the African Union Commission Headquarters. He underlined the importance of the first consultation in the region on the process for the preparation of the new global framework that would map out the next steps towards achieving the vision of living in harmony with nature, and reiterated the support of the Commission for the process. He also recalled the African Ministerial Summit on Biodiversity and the fourteenth meeting of the Conference of the Parties, held in Sham-el Sheikh, Egypt, in November 2018, and noted that the Commission was honoured to collaborate with the Government of Egypt, the Secretariat of the Convention and the United Nations Environment Programme in organizing the Summit.

82. 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, 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 preparing a post-2020 global biodiversity framework which would include several regional and thematic consultations. The African consultation was the third after the consultation for Asia and the Pacific, held in Nagoya, Japan, and for the Western Europe and Others Group, held in Bonn. She encouraged participants to actively participate in the discussions during the meeting and to engage in the entire process, noting that the framework would be shaped by their ideas, expertise, and practical experience. She also challenged participants to think creatively and ambitiously, but pragmatically so as to design a transformative pathway that would enable humanity to reach the vision of living in harmony with nature by 2050. She thanked the African Union Commission and the African Union Development Agency-NEPAD for co-organizing the consultation and the Government of the United Kingdom, the New Partnership for Africa's Development (NEPAD) and the SABI Strategy Group for providing the financial support.

83. Mr. Hamdallah Zedan (Egypt), delivering remarks on behalf of Ms. Yasmine Fouad, Minister of Environment of Egypt and President of the fourteenth meeting of the Conference of the Parties, welcomed participants to the consultation. He expressed Egypt's pleasure at having successfully hosted the last United Nations Biodiversity Conference and its high-level segment as well as the African Ministerial Summit on Biodiversity in Sharm El-Sheikh in November 2018. He noted that the African Ministerial Summit had adopted a [Ministerial Declaration on Biodiversity](#), including the [Pan-African Action Agenda on Ecosystem Restoration for Increased Resilience](#) and [Africa's Biodiversity Priorities](#). This, he said, demonstrated the strong political commitment of Africa on biodiversity and its desire to have an effective post-2020 global biodiversity framework addressing the interests and aspirations of Africa.

84. Mr. Kwame Ababio, Senior Programme Officer, speaking on behalf of the Chief Executive Officer of the African Development Agency/NEPAD, said AUDA-NEPAD was delighted to have co-organized the consultation. He noted that the consultation would assist the region to start developing a common understanding and united voice ahead of the landmark fifteenth meeting of the Conference of Parties, at which a global framework for biodiversity would be adopted. He noted that the African Union Assembly of Heads of State and Government and the Ministerial Conference on the Environment (AMCEN) had reiterated through various resolutions that biodiversity in Africa represented the continent's most valuable asset, underpinning the developmental aspirations of its people. For that reason, several initiatives and frameworks, such as the Environment Action Plan and Algiers and Maputo Conventions, had been adopted at the continental and regional levels to ensure sound biodiversity management. He also noted that the African Ministerial Summit on Biodiversity, held in Egypt in November 2018, had adopted, inter alia,

Africa's Biodiversity Priorities⁶ and that the follow-up Consultative Workshop on the Outcomes of the Summit, held in Nairobi on 9 and 10 March 2019, had further elaborated on those priorities.⁷

Item 2. Introduction and purpose of the Consultation

85. 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), provided an overview of the process for the preparation of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework, highlighting the main contents of decision [14/34](#). They described the context for the process, including the relevant decisions of the Conference of the Parties and of the Conference of the Parties serving as the meetings of the Parties to the Protocols, and outlined the proposed organization of work for the process including dates for key meetings and the roles and responsibilities of relevant entities — the bureau, co-chairs, secretariat, Parties, the Subsidiary Body on Scientific, Technical and Technological Advice, the Subsidiary Body on Implementation and the high-level panel. They noted that the process would have three “phases”: (a) to collect views from the regions through consultations; (b) to undertake thematic consultations; and (c) to bring those two elements together for consideration by the Open-ended Working Group. They noted that the process would be considered a success if it, inter alia, created good will, enabled decision-making at the fifteenth meeting of the Conference of the Parties, was supported by Parties and stakeholders and addressed their expectations and results in global framework that would be owned by Parties, which would facilitate its expedient implementation. In concluding, they noted that the purpose of the regional consultation was not about coming to agreed conclusions but rather to identify issues and to begin exchanging views.⁸

Item 3. Organization of work and election of co-chairs and rapporteur

86. Following the Co-Chair's presentation, Mr. Erie Tamale (CBD) introduced the agenda and the proposed organization of work⁹ and invited participants to elect officers for the meeting.

87. Participants elected Mr. Melesse Maryo (Ethiopia) and Ms. Prudence Galega (Cameroon) to serve as co-chairs for the meeting and Ms. El Khitma Awad Mohammed Ahmed (Sudan) as rapporteur. Ms. Patricia Kameri-Mbote (Professor, University of Nairobi) served as the facilitator for the consultation.

88. Participants introduced themselves¹⁰ and were then invited to write their expectations for the consultation on paper cards and submit them to the facilitator.

Item 4. Current state of affairs and future trends

89. This session addressed the current state of biodiversity and future trends in the region. Mr. Levis Kavagi (UNEP) provided an overview of the key messages from the *Report of the Regional Assessment on Biodiversity and Ecosystem Services for Africa* which had been undertaken by the Intergovernmental Science-Policy Platform on Biodiversity and Ecosystem Services (IPBES). He highlighted the status and trends of biodiversity in the region, the main drivers of biodiversity loss, measures taken to protect biodiversity, the challenges faced, and various options Africa had to respond to the challenges.¹¹

90. Mr. Dan Leskien (FAO) presented an overview of the *State of the World's Biodiversity for Food and Agriculture* based on a report that had been published by the Food and Agriculture Organization of the

⁶ See the Summit's documents at <https://www.cbd.int/conferences/2018/cop-14-afr-hls/documents>

⁷ See the report at <https://www.cbd.int/doc/c/38b8/417d/ecc28b57c981d0b81105f30c/post2020-ws-2019-03-report-en.pdf>

⁸ The co-chairs presentation is accessible from <https://www.cbd.int/meetings/POST2020-WS-2019-03>

⁹ See [CBD/POST2020/WS/2019/1/1](#) and [CBD/POST2020/WS/2019/1/1/Add.1](#).

¹⁰ The list of participants is accessible from <https://www.cbd.int/doc/c/511b/30dc/d6cd3dd5b7ea3cc572ecb59d/post2020-ws-2019-03-participant-list-en.pdf>

¹¹ The presentation is accessible from <https://www.cbd.int/doc/c/9f7a/3436/598b0261db0300bd49636cd4/post2020-ws-2019-03-ipbes-en.pdf> and the full report from <https://www.ipbes.net/assessment-reports/africa>

United Nations (FAO) in February 2019.¹² He briefly described the current status of biodiversity for food and agriculture and the multiple interacting drivers of change affecting it. He also highlighted the biodiversity-friendly practices increasingly being used but noted that enabling frameworks for the sustainable use and conservation of biodiversity for food and agriculture remained insufficient.

91. Ms. Jyoti Mathur-Filipp (CBD) provided a short update on the preparation of the fifth edition of the *Global Biodiversity Outlook* (GBO-5) and the submission of the sixth national reports. She invited Parties that had not yet done so to submit their reports and contribute relevant information for GBO-5, underlining the critical importance of these documents in informing the preparation of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework.

92. Following the presentations, participants asked a few questions and engaged in a short discussion in plenary. They noted that, while a number of studies and assessments on biodiversity had been undertaken in the few years preceding, their findings and key messages had not been effectively communicated or used to guide policy and decision-making. In part, that was due to ineffective communication tools and approaches used and failure to use simple straightforward language that decision makers and the public could easily understand. To address this challenge, we need to use more effective tools and approaches to communicate factual but inspirational messages to decision makers and the public using simple straightforward language they can easily understand.

93. A number of participants cautioned that our communication should not focus too much on the negative findings of various assessments and on the gloom and doom messages about biodiversity loss. We should also communicate and highlight the value of biodiversity and ecosystem services and their contribution to social and economic development and people's well-being. In that regard, participants noted the urgent need to develop capacity on natural capital accounting and valuation of biodiversity in the region.

Item 5. Implementation opportunities and challenges in the region and insights for the post-2020 framework

94. In the afternoon of the first day, participants formed discussion groups to reflect on opportunities and challenges in the region that could impact on the post-2020 global biodiversity framework and the realization of the 2050 vision of "living in harmony with nature. They also reflected on how the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020 had or had not enabled national implementation action and what could be changed or improved. Following the group discussions, each group provided a report back to the plenary.

95. After the plenary discussion, international organizations supporting Parties in the implementation of the Convention and the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity then participated in a panel discussion on the opportunities, challenges and insights from their work for the development and implementation of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework. The panel members were Ms. Saskia Marijnissen (UNDP), Mr. Levis Kavagi (UNEP), Ms. Nora Berrahmouni (FAO), Mr. Charles Karangwa (IUCN), Mr. Kwame Ababio (AUDA-NEPAD) and Mr. Suhel al-Janabi (ABS Capacity Development Initiative). The panellists shared perspectives and insights from their work and then responded to questions from participants.

Item 6. Developing the post-2020 framework

A. Introduction of the discussion paper on the post-2020 global biodiversity framework

96. During this session, the Co-Chairs of the Open-ended Working Group introduced the discussion paper on the post-2020 global biodiversity framework (CBD/POST2020/PREP/1/1).¹³ They gave a snapshot of the submissions received on the scope and content of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework and introduced a series of questions to facilitate further discussions. They clarified that the

¹² The presentation is accessible from <https://www.cbd.int/doc/c/8539/3726/5464d06f51f70532f922ea67/post2020-ws-2019-03-fao-en.pdf> and the full report from <http://www.fao.org/cgrfa/topics/biodiversity/sowbfa/en>.

¹³ The presentation is accessible from <https://www.cbd.int/doc/c/de91/2533/f01a9d0c1ec92e0842094f03/post2020-ws-2019-03-overview-en.pdf>

questions were not intended to limit or prejudge the outcomes of the process for developing the post-2020 global biodiversity framework. Following the presentation, participants asked questions and presented initial views and suggestions.

B. Shaping and communicating new narratives for biodiversity

97. During this session, Ms. Margaret Egbula (CBD) made a presentation on communications and the post-2020 biodiversity framework.¹⁴ She noted that the Secretariat was in the process of preparing a communications strategy to raise the profile of biodiversity, encourage people to follow and engage in the negotiations to contribute to a strong post-2020 global biodiversity framework and ultimately support its implementation. The strategy would be coherent with clear and consistent messaging, science-based yet understandable to non-expert audiences and linked to the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development and other global priorities. It would also be comprehensive and innovative and would aim at maximizing new technologies and platforms including social media, testing new approaches and narratives, and reaching out to new audiences using more visually compelling and dynamic communications. She also introduced the online platform for the Sharm El-Sheikh to Kunming Action Agenda for Nature and People¹⁵ and urged participants to use it to submit and showcase their contributions and commitments to biodiversity. In concluding, she invited participants to share their views on what had worked well, what had not worked well and what was missing or needed improvement from the Secretariat's communications. Following the presentation, participants asked questions and engaged in a short discussion in the plenary. The main points raised during the discussion are summarized under section II, sub-section C.

Item 7. Visioning the world we want in 2050: thinking out of the box

98. During this session, Ms. Jyoti Mathur-Filipp (CBD) made a presentation on transition management.¹⁶ Following the presentation, participants separated into discussion groups to identify concrete actions to help bend the curve of biodiversity loss by 2030 and foster transformative change. They were challenged to think out of the box during their discussions. Following the group discussions, participants, using a dominoes game exercise, jointly developed a set of interlinked actions and possible pathways towards realizing the 2050 vision of "living in harmony with nature".

Item 8. Integrating diverse perspectives

99. During this session, participants representing various organizations took part in a panel discussion and shared their views on how the perspectives of various stakeholders groups should be reflected in the post-2020 global biodiversity framework and how their actions could be facilitated and enhanced in the eventual implementation of the framework. Presentations were made by Ms. Lucy Mullenkei (IIFB) for indigenous peoples and local communities, Mr. Freddrick Kumah (WWF) for civil society, Ms. Fiesta Warinwa (AWF) for community groups, Ms. Gertrude Kenyangi (SWAGEN) for women, Ms. Sanda Rakotomalala (GYBN) for youth and Mr. Gemedo Dalle Tussie (Addis Ababa University) for academia and research institutions. Following the presentations, the panellists answered questions from the participants.

Item 9. Possible elements of the post-2020 framework

100. During this session, participants separated into groups to consider issues related to the scope and content of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework. The issues were grouped and discussed under the following eight stations using a world café format:

- (a) Structure of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework and biodiversity targets;

¹⁴ The presentation is accessible from <https://www.cbd.int/doc/c/4696/01da/9064575d10a42d05e77d5c3d/post2020-ws-2019-03-communication-en.pdf>

¹⁵ www.cbd.int/action-agenda

¹⁶ The presentation is accessible from <https://www.cbd.int/doc/c/889a/afe9/c71f19f25d977020d2d3c1e5/post2020-ws-2019-03-vision-en.pdf>

- (b) Integration of issues related to the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety and the Nagoya Protocol on Access and Benefit-sharing into the post-2020 global biodiversity framework;
- (c) Mainstreaming of biodiversity into relevant sectors and across society and economies at large and relationship with other relevant processes;
- (d) Resource mobilization and voluntary commitments and contributions;
- (e) Capacity-building, technical and scientific cooperation and knowledge management;
- (f) Communication and outreach;
- (g) Integrating diverse perspectives and gender considerations;
- (h) National implementation, NBSAPs, review processes and mechanisms for accountability.

101. Each group visited all eight stations, and facilitators of the stations synthesized the discussions and reported back to plenary.

102. Participants then reflected on the reports from all the eight stations and identified the following as items that required further consideration:

- (a) Resource mobilization and financial mechanism;
- (b) Regional cooperation;
- (c) Accountability/compliance;
- (d) Structure of the post-2020 framework.

Item 10. Wrap-up and closure of the consultation

103. During this session, participants shared their reflections on the outcomes of the consultation workshop. The Co-Chairs of the Open-ended Working Group also reflected on outcomes of the regional consultation and outlined the next steps and expectations in the process for developing the post-2020 global biodiversity framework.

104. Following remarks by Ms. Jyoti Mathur-Filipp (CBD), Mr. Hamdallah Zedan (Egypt), and Mr. Livingstone Sindayigaya (AUC), the consultation closed at 1 pm on 5 April 2019.
