



Convention on Biological Diversity

Distr.
GENERAL

CBD/POST2020/WS/2019/2/2
19 June 2019

ENGLISH ONLY

REPORT OF THE REGIONAL CONSULTATION ON THE POST-2020 GLOBAL BIODIVERSITY FRAMEWORK FOR THE WESTERN EUROPEAN AND OTHERS GROUP AND OTHER MEMBERS OF THE EUROPEAN UNION, BONN, 19-21 MARCH 2019

I. BACKGROUND AND PURPOSE

1. At its fourteenth meeting, the Conference of the Parties to the Convention on Biological Diversity 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 be held as a platform for the discussions.
3. The Regional Consultation on the Post-2020 Global Biodiversity Framework for the Western European and Others Group and Other Members of the European Union was held from in Bonn 19 to 21 March 2019. The workshop was organized by the Secretariat of the Convention on Biological Diversity in collaboration with the [Federal Ministry for the Environment, Nature Conservation and Nuclear Safety of Germany](#) under the guidance of the Co-Chairs of the Open-ended Working Group. The Consultation was attended by representatives of the Parties to the Convention from the region, as well as relevant organizations.¹ The Consultation was conducted in English with sessions in plenary and break-out groups.
4. The present report details the outcomes of the Consultation as they relate to the development of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework. Section III provides an account of the proceedings of the consultation.²

II. PROCEEDINGS OF THE CONSULTATION

A. Opening of the Consultation and organizational matters

5. The Consultation was opened on 19 March 2019 by Ms. Christiane Paulus, Director General, Nature Conservation and Sustainable Use of Natural Resources, Federal Ministry for the Environment, Nature Conservation and Nuclear Safety, Germany. In her remarks,³ she welcomed the participants to the consultation and noted that preparations for the current strategic plan had started in Bonn during the ninth

¹ The list of participants in the workshop is accessible from <https://www.cbd.int/doc/c/93db/8782/c11974c8ae1d62b8b5e3c4da/post2020-ws-2019-02-participant-list-en.pdf>

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

³ The complete text of the statement is accessible from <https://www.cbd.int/doc/c/7815/37d4/4d817f15627188dac8edda64/post2020-ws-2019-02-statement-paulus-en.pdf>

meeting of the Conference of the Parties. She emphasized the importance of mainstreaming biodiversity across sectors as an aid to the implementation of the Convention.

6. Mr. Alexander Shestakov, Director of the Science, Society and Sustainable Futures Division, SCBD delivered opening remarks on behalf of Ms. Cristiana Paşca Palmer, Executive Secretary of the Convention on Biological Diversity. In his remarks, he noted that the Conference of the Parties to the Convention on Biological Diversity, at its fourteenth meeting, had formally had set in motion the preparatory process for crafting a post-2020 global biodiversity framework and this consultation was the second in a series of regional and thematic consultations which would determine the future direction of the Convention.

7. The Co-Chairs of the Open-ended Working Group provided an overview of the process for developing the post-2020 global biodiversity framework. They explained the contents of decision 14/34 and related decisions that laid out the outline of the process. 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 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 emphasized that the purpose of the regional consultations was not negotiation but, rather, to identify issues and to begin exchanging views.⁴

8. Following the presentation by the Co-Chairs, Mr. Yosuke Kuramoto (Japan) gave a very brief recap of the first regional consultation, held in Nagoya, Japan, in January 2019. He noted that the lessons learned from that consultation had fed into the planning for the current consultation. Additionally, the potential for a thematic workshop on landscapes and seascapes was highlighted.

9. Following the opening remarks, the facilitator, Mr. Neville Ash (United Nations Environment Programme-World Conservation Monitoring Centre) provided an overview of the agenda for the consultation. Participants then decided that Ms. Inka Gnittke (Germany) and Ms. Rosemary Paterson (New Zealand) would serve as co-chairs for the meeting. It was also decided that Mr. Anne Theo Seinen (European Union) would serve as rapporteur.

B. Current state of affairs and future trends

10. This session addressed the current state of biodiversity and future trends. Mr. Shestakov provided an overview of information relating to the preparation of the fifth edition of the *Global Biodiversity Outlook* and the nearly 60 sixth national reports received to date. Following this, Ms. Anne Laurigauderie (Intergovernmental Science-Policy Platform on Biodiversity and Ecosystem Services) provided an overview of the multiple *Regional Assessment Reports on Biodiversity and Ecosystem Services* for the regions, and the upcoming *Global Assessment* undertaken by the Intergovernmental Science-Policy Platform on Biodiversity and Ecosystem Services (IPBES).⁵ Ms. Julie Belanger (Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations)⁶ gave a presentation on the recently released *State of the World's Biodiversity for Food and Agriculture*.

11. During the second half of the 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 Mr. Christian Schwarzer (Global Youth Biodiversity Network),⁷ Ms. Rachel

⁴ The presentation of the Co-Chairs is accessible from <https://www.cbd.int/doc/c/3adf/a596/1ac26945dbf2c19a7d530eab/post2020-ws-2019-02-presentation-co-chairs-02-en.pdf>

⁵ The presentation is accessible from <https://www.cbd.int/doc/c/7cf1/aa61/71ab8cbaf1cf90d8c741b64e/post2020-ws-2019-04-presentation-05-en.pdf>

⁶ The presentation is accessible from <https://www.cbd.int/doc/c/8a3f/394b/41138b3770ac6e933f166fca/post2020-ws-2019-02-presentation-fao-sowbfa-en.pdf>

⁷ The presentation is accessible from <https://www.cbd.int/doc/c/96e1/c86f/a8b62ca2a8ed84b0f97dd76b/post2020-ws-2019-02-presentation-gybn-youth-en.pdf>

Levesque and Mr. Holger Robrecht (Local Governments for Sustainability (ICLEI)),⁸ Ms. Concha Salguero Herrera, Ms. Christine von Weizsäcker and Ms. Emma Courtine (CBD Women's Caucus), and Mr. Aslak Holmberg and Ms. Christine Teresa Grant (indigenous peoples and local communities).⁹ Following the presentations, presenters responded to questions from participants.

C. Out-of-the-box thinking and tools for an ambitious post-2020 global framework

12. During this session, Mr. Pepik Henneman (Meneer de Leeuw) made a presentation¹⁰ on transitions management. Following the presentation, participants separated into small groups of three to discuss a transition in a place they were familiar with by acting as an observer, interviewer and interviewee.

D. Shaping and communicating new narratives for biodiversity

13. During this session, Mr. Ari Ratner (CBD) made a presentation on communication for the post-2020 biodiversity framework.¹¹ Following the presentation, the presenter took questions from the participants.

E. Elements for a post-2020 framework

14. 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](https://www.cbd.int/doc/c/0c9a/9cf0/162577005dbf8dac869f25e8/post2020-ws-2019-02-presentation-iclei-subnational-en.pdf)). In their presentation, they summarized some of the steps completed thus far in the process, provided a synthesis of submissions received thus far, and gave a preview of some questions for discussion and thinking about potential framework elements.¹²

15. 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 national biodiversity strategies and action plans (NBSAPs);
- (m) New mechanisms for accountability and review processes.

⁸ The presentation is accessible from <https://www.cbd.int/doc/c/0c9a/9cf0/162577005dbf8dac869f25e8/post2020-ws-2019-02-presentation-iclei-subnational-en.pdf>

⁹ The presentation is accessible from <https://www.cbd.int/doc/c/491d/314b/2a40ebc342461046e27a08c6/post2020-ws-2019-02-presentation-iplc-en.pdf>

¹⁰ The presentation is accessible from <https://www.cbd.int/doc/c/6029/7b5b/5e49ff7b2552716ebf66fb85/post2020-ws-2019-02-presentation-henneman-transitions-en.pdf>

¹¹ The presentation is accessible from <https://www.cbd.int/doc/c/5317/aff0/c0b55645a95c7b9478d74b8c/post2020-ws-2019-02-presentation-ratner-communication-en.pdf>

¹² The presentation is accessible from <https://www.cbd.int/doc/c/8e96/83f4/6740fdd386b2963626f4c9aa/post2020-ws-2019-02-presentation-co-chairs-01-en.pdf>

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

16. 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.

F. What will need to be further reflected upon and/or consulted

17. During this session, the Co-Chairs introduced several themes that emerged from the feedback from participants based on the first two days of discussion and had been most requested by participants for further discussion during the final day of the workshop. These included:

- (a) Voluntary commitments;
- (b) Integration across the Protocols and multilateral environmental agreements (MEAs);
- (c) A 2030 mission;
- (d) Accountability/monitoring, review and verification;
- (e) The structure of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework.

The participants then broke into smaller groups for discussion, and, following this, each group reported back to the plenary. The outcome of those discussions is reflected in section B of the annex.

G. Closure of the workshop

18. During this session, participants shared their reflections on the outcomes of the consultation workshop. Participants from civil society, youth, women, subnational governments, regional MEAs and indigenous peoples and local communities were invited to give their reflections on the previous days' work.

19. 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 Mr. Shestakov (SCBD) and the regional co-chairs, the workshop closed.

*Annex***VIEWS ON THE SCOPE AND CONTENT ON THE POST-2020 GLOBAL BIODIVERSITY FRAMEWORK FROM PARTICIPANTS IN THE REGIONAL CONSULTATION FOR THE WESTERN EUROPEAN AND OTHERS GROUP AND OTHER MEMBERS OF THE EUROPEAN UNION**

1. 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 for the Western European and Others Group and Other Members of the European Union. The synthesis provides an overview of the perspectives and views 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.

2. The Western European and Others region is a large, diverse region with rich biodiversity in a variety of settings, both urban and rural. It is also a culturally diverse region where there are many indigenous people and local communities, civil society organizations and businesses that are actively working on issues related to conservation and sustainable use.

3. The region is undergoing urban population growth, economic development and other socioeconomic changes which will need to be considered 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. The current strategic plan does not adequately address issues of urban biodiversity, and it was recommended that the future framework include more specific targets for urban ecosystems.

4. The amount and quality of biodiversity information is increasing rapidly, including due to IPBES. While this is helpful from a planning perspective, it also creates challenges in internalizing this information and making practical use of it. However, there is an opportunity in that we now have more knowledge and evidence to understand which targets work and where there are gaps and opportunities for new goals.

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

5. While the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020 provided a good global framework, which was generally viewed as ambitious, many participants noted that it might have been unrealistic and that the biodiversity community should learn from the successes and challenges of its implementation.

6. The importance of having a post-2020 framework which is more measurable than the current Strategic Plan was noted. To support it, the need for more practical and relevant national biodiversity indicators was also highlighted.

7. There were several suggestions of the importance of ongoing milestones within the plan, such as those that can be reviewed at five-year or other intervals. Many felt that a 10-year plan should be rethought.

8. With the adoption of the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development, there is a need to consider how future biodiversity goals/targets will relate to or compliment the Sustainable Development Goals. Similarly, the need to link future biodiversity goals/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. In addition, the implementation of the Sustainable Development Goals provided an opportunity, but also a challenge, to engage with other ministries which traditionally are not closely linked to biodiversity.

9. 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 preserve biodiversity.

10. While the main responsibility for implementing the Convention lies with Parties, it is indispensable 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.

11. The importance of paying greater attention to sustainable consumption and production, and mainstreaming, in the post-2020 period was also noted by many participants. In the region, consumption patterns are ever increasing, and this must be addressed as a challenge. At the European Union level, regulations for agriculture are strengthened, but industrial agriculture remains a challenge for the region. There is a need for commitments for regulatory action to better address the need for businesses to act to protect biodiversity.

12. An emphasis was made on the current challenge of messaging for the Strategic Plan, with a recommendation that the future framework have clear messaging and simpler communication.

13. The current engagement of youth with the climate change movement and the increasing awareness of environmental issues can provide an opportunity for better uptake of biodiversity issues into mainstream society. Scientific messaging is being done in a more singular way, and there is growing coverage of biodiversity issues by the media. There continues to be a need for improved communication of the values of biodiversity, especially utilizing an ecosystem valuation approach.

14. Finally, there is a general need for more resources, including human, technical and financial, for the implementation of the Convention.

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

15. 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

16. Participants identified two possible scenarios for the structure of the goals/targets of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework:

(a) To adopt a structure or framework similar to what was used in the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020;

(b) To reorganize the structure and organization of the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020 around three clusters (see para. 18 below), building on the current targets and modify it to reflect new elements and information.

17. There was no consensus on a preferred approach, but, for one scenario, the focus was on presenting the targets in a more communicable way, and, for the other, the focus was more on continuity and simplicity. Some participants noted that the structure of the entire framework should be addressed, not just the structure of the targets.

18. Participants recommended that goals/targets be based on three major clusters:

(a) *Objectives/outcome*: state of biodiversity and nature's contributions to people (as shown by key indicators);

(b) *Actions taken to achieve transformational change and mainstreaming*: tackle the drivers of biodiversity loss, contribute to the Sustainable Development Goals, provide solutions to climate change and implement the three objectives of the Convention (conservation, sustainable use, and access and benefit-sharing);

(c) *Enabling conditions*: what is needed to support implementation (awareness, valuation, communications, resource mobilization, data, knowledge, capacity-building, governance).

19. There was a broad understanding that there should be no hierarchy between different clusters of goals/targets as all are important and complementary to each other, irrespective of the way they are presented (pyramid or circular shape, etc). In addition, the concept of implementation mechanisms to support the targets was introduced.

20. 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 for developing the post-2020 global biodiversity framework. However, it was noted that all targets could be made “SMART”-er with more focus on measurability and simplification. There was also discussion of the differences between outputs, outcomes and impacts and how to best track progress. Additionally, alignment with other conventions and processes was noted as important.

21. With regard to access and benefit-sharing and biosafety, it was felt that they should be reflected in the post-2020 global biodiversity framework in some form, but there was no clear indication if that should be separate goals/targets or integrated throughout.

2. *Mission*

22. There was additional discussion on the mission statement. There was discussion regarding the need to clarify what “living in harmony with nature” means. What does it look like? What are the desired outcomes for biodiversity and society? How do we know how to achieve it if we do not know what it is?

23. Participants suggested a possible approach to a definition: “Living in harmony with nature: whereby biodiversity (genes, species, ecosystems) sustains, enhances and secures nature’s contributions to people everywhere. Biodiversity provides more, or at least as much, opportunity to society in 2050 as it does to us now”.

24. Following the first two days of discussion, the Co-Chairs recommended the creation of a new subgroup to discuss a potential 2030 mission statement. Some participants noted a challenge in that regard: how do you devise a mission statement prior to the negotiation of any new post-2020 global biodiversity framework? How do you have a successful negotiation without a mission statement?

25. Participants expressed a desire to define the word “transformative”. Much of the discussion centred around the need for improved communication by utilizing simpler language – such as “nature” instead of “biodiversity” – and the importance of having communication strategies for a clear mission. The establishment of milestones towards the 2050 vision of living in harmony with nature, such as protection of 30 per cent of forests, land, water, etc., was noted by participants as a potential basis for a mission statement.

3. *Sustainable Development Goals*

26. It was observed by some that the Sustainable Development Goals have a higher political profile than current 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 goals/targets should be formulated in such a way as to be easily linked to the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development.

4. *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.

28. It was noted that it is important to use the language and terminology of other sectors to communicate the benefits and costs of biodiversity, and that continuing communication with stakeholders across sectors to encourage ownership of the process was imperative. It was also noted that the Global

Environment Facility had developed a definition of mainstreaming that might be useful, as there were a variety of definitions in use, and that communication must be clear.

29. The importance of linking the post-2020 global biodiversity framework to other societal challenges, including climate change, and the use of nature-based solutions to mitigate it was also noted. Additionally, the importance of ensuring coherence between the post-2020 global biodiversity framework and the strategies, frameworks and targets of other international agreements, especially the Sustainable Development Goals, was noted.

30. There were different ideas on how mainstreaming could be reflected in the post-2020 global biodiversity framework and how it would be related to the Strategic Approach on Mainstreaming, which is to be further elaborated as per the decision of the Conference of the Parties as an approach or tool for implementation and not as a goal/target in and of itself; current targets on mainstreaming were seen as being too general for understanding what other sectors should do.

31. In addition, 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. The involvement of all levels of government from both the top and the bottom, from Heads of State and from lower levels, was needed to ensure that the biodiversity agenda was supported in national agendas across multiple ministries.

5. Resource mobilization

32. Participants expressed the view that the resource mobilization strategy and/or any goals/targets related to resource mobilization should be informed by an assessment of the cost of no action on biodiversity loss.

33. 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.

34. Linking biodiversity financing to climate change could also help to increase the resources available. More generally, the need for a more effective and strategic use of resources, including financial, technical and human, was noted.

35. With regard to the Global Environment Facility, some participants felt that simpler procedures were required to access financial support, but with accountability and a balance between government and private funding, both national and international.

36. It was suggested that, in developing the post-2020 framework, resource mobilization should be linked to the mainstreaming agenda.

6. Voluntary commitments

37. Participants generally felt that there was a need for both global goals/targets and voluntary commitments. It was felt that they should not be just an administrative step, but also at least minimally binding and include some kind of mechanism for reporting. Several participants noted that commitments should be made by Parties but also by stakeholders and endorsed by high-level actors.

38. The creation of a more visible web-based portal allowing commitments and involvement by non-state actors into the CBD process was recommended as a tool to facilitate that work. Participants discussed whether some basic criteria were necessary for those commitments. They noted that it was important to provide freedom of opportunity to enter commitments, but with some basic criteria in order to ensure follow-up. Following the adoption of the post-2020 framework, it was suggested that a different style of commitment could be created with a more robust set of criteria, a follow-up and reporting process, and direct linkages to targets and goals as they were adopted.

39. Some participants recommended that the momentum of the negotiation and adoption of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework be used to strengthen those voluntary commitments. Those

commitments should be beyond just NBSAPs. However, participants also suggested that there should be additional commitments directly linked to NBSAPs. A concern was noted that voluntary commitments might lower the ambition level of NBSAPs or targets. Several examples were given of previous commitment drives, such as the Bonn Challenge for restoration, the Honolulu Challenge on invasive alien species and the Pollinators Partnership.

7. Communication

40. The majority of participants emphasized that communication would be important in the post-2020 period and that communication at all levels would be required. Communication is particularly critical as it will increase political will for good decisions in the near future, especially at the national level.

41. The need for clear messages was noted, as was the importance of linkages with other processes, especially with climate change. The public does not understand what a COP is or what CBD is, but citizens do understand what it means to save the planet. Examples of the campaign against plastics and the loss of insects were highlighted as potential models, and the momentum from existing movements such as youth walkouts and related conversations should be harnessed.

42. It was suggested that the CBD community at all levels needs to better coordinate among itself and increase the resources available, such as tool kits, lists, coordination infrastructure and funding.

8. Capacity-building

43. Capacity-building was noted as an important issue for the post-2020 global biodiversity framework. For ambitious targets to be successful, capacity-building will be needed, especially in terms of indicators and reporting. It was suggested that capacity-building look at other MEAs and protocols as examples for best practices and synergies. In addition, it was recommended that capacity-building be tailored to individual national or stakeholder needs, including the sharing of traditional knowledge. It was suggested that funding for capacity-building should be linked to targets and reporting, and to define specific indicators.

9. Integrating diverse perspectives

44. The need for the post-2020 global biodiversity framework to consider diverse perspectives on biodiversity issues was noted. Many participants highlighted the importance of government engagement with all groups as they develop their positions on biodiversity-related issues. Additionally, it was mentioned that it was important to not just use engagement as inputs into negotiations, but to empower all groups and to clearly engage and involve all stakeholders. It was suggested that there was a need to build on and refer to the Sustainable Development Goals for issues relating to business, and the importance of policy development and other compulsory legislative measures relating to the supply chain was highlighted.

45. 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 goal/target on this issue.

46. There was the recommendation to not have just a single target relating to gender, but rather to build upon the relevant Sustainable Development Goals. Participants noted the role of women as agents of change, but also that women and children are the most negatively impacted by biodiversity loss.

10. National biodiversity strategies and action plans

47. 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. Many participants also indicated a desire to keep the long-term focus of NBSAPs, but also to potentially create some form of a shorter-term strategic document with more flexibility and including voluntary commitments.

48. There is a desire for consistent content in all NBSAPs relating to global goals and targets, but with flexibility on how it is done in a country.

49. There were suggestions of a common reporting framework to enhance transparency in outcomes, as it was difficult to view progress through national reports. It was suggested that NBSAPs should show not only national actions and consequences for domestic biodiversity, but also include a new dimension showing how the country is contributing to global goals.

50. Regional strategies could be reflected in NBSAPs. Participants also indicated a desire to continue the peer-review process for NBSAPs past the pilot project to encourage best practices. However, there was some division of opinion on the review process's role, whether to be supportive and positive, or to admonish those who had not met their goals.

11. Review mechanisms and accountability

51. There was wide consensus on the crucial importance of transparency, accountability and monitoring, reporting and verification (MRV). Many participants 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 a verification mechanism was stated, along with other elements, such as monitoring and review. The need for regular reviews of progress in implementation was noted as well as the need for goals, targets, indicators and baselines to monitor progress.

52. Some participants mentioned that many indicators already existed in different databases and they could be used in new and better ways. The OECD workshop¹³ on targets, indicators and measurability had highlighted how currently available data and indicators could be used to inform target creation, where the priorities lay and where the key gaps remained.

53. Indicators must also be developed at the same time as the goals/targets in order to ensure coherence. This is very important for the organization of further preparations of the post-2020 framework.

54. Any monitoring and review systems must be transparent and utilize a “common currency” in order to consistently measure progress.

55. Parties and others also need capacity-building and clear guidance on how to monitor implementation. Participants also suggested that any monitoring system should be linked to voluntary commitments and that it could be built in a step-wise manner, by first analysing the current status and then increasing requirements. Best practices and lessons learned from other monitoring and review processes, such as the Montreal Protocol and the Sustainable Development Goals, were potential tools for building such a mechanism.

56. Many participants emphasized the need to avoid weakening and rather strengthen the existing NBSAP processes. Similarly, many participants were mindful of the administrative burden and suggested building on the national reporting framework. It was also expressed that any further tools and mechanisms developed should be based on the lessons learned within the CBD and under other international processes, and should not be considered just a technical, scientific process but also one to improve the political momentum towards implementation.

12. Integration across Protocols and MEAs

57. Following the first two days of discussion, the Co-Chairs recommended the creation of a sub-group to further discuss integration of the Protocols and MEAs into the framework. Participants agreed that the Protocols and other MEAs are an integral part of the framework and should be included in the agenda of the Open-Ended Working Group, as well as biodiversity-related MEAs wherever possible. It was

¹³ <http://www.oecd.org/environment/resources/biodiversity/oecdexpertworkshoponthepost-2020biodiversityframeworktarget indicatorsandmeasurabilityimplicationsatglobalandnationallevel.htm>.

mentioned that shared responsibilities need to be clarified and actions and goals/targets that are better served by another MEA could be shared. There was also agreement that expiring targets should be replaced with new ones to better integrate the Convention across wider processes.

58. Some participants noted that better integration with the Protocols and other MEAs could help to create ownership for shared objectives across government ministries and other institutions. It was agreed that there were barriers to better integration, including legal challenges, timing of relevant body meetings, and incomplete ratification by Parties across different instruments. It was noted that a workshop providing inputs towards the post-2020 global biodiversity framework among biodiversity-related MEAs and other relevant stakeholders would be held in June 2019 in Switzerland.
