



Convention on Biological Diversity

Distr.
GENERAL

CBD/COP/14/INF/27
4 September 2018

ENGLISH ONLY

CONFERENCE OF THE PARTIES TO THE
CONVENTION ON BIOLOGICAL DIVERSITY

Fourteenth meeting

Sharm El-Sheikh, Egypt, 17-29 November 2018

SEMINAR ON TRANSFORMATIONAL CHANGE FOR THE BIODIVERSITY AGENDA

Note by the Executive Secretary

INTRODUCTION

1. At its fifteenth meeting, in Beijing in 2020, the Conference of the Parties to the Convention on Biological Diversity are due to adopt a post-2020 global framework for biodiversity. Building on the current Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020, the post-2020 global framework is expected to provide a framework or “global pact” for the international community to address the underlying pressures and challenge of biodiversity and ecosystems loss. Additionally, it seeks to ensure that natural capital and the solutions and benefits nature provides, are integrated in systemic, inclusive, and transformative actions to benefit human well-being, the economy and the planet.

2. With the adoption of the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development and the Sustainable Development Goals, along with decisions of the Conference of the Parties, it is being recognized that the lead-up to 2020 and beyond requires urgent transformational change in the approaches taken to safeguard, restore and invest in biodiversity. This involves (a) changes in behaviour at the levels of producers, consumers, governments and businesses, (b) a deeper understanding, based on scientific evidence, of the factors, motivations and levers that can facilitate such transformational change, and (c) innovation in the means of implementation.

3. At the twenty-first meeting of the Subsidiary Body on Scientific, Technical and Technological Advice, held in Montreal, Canada, in December 2017, Parties noted that societal and disruptive technological developments can lead to transitions that may contribute to, or counter, sustainability and the achievement of the three objectives of the Convention. The Subsidiary Body noted that Governments and international institutions could play leading roles in establishing an enabling environment to foster positive change. To this end, further work is required, not only to identify the ways and means to facilitate transformational change for the biodiversity agenda at different levels, but also to examine what the Convention and the post-2020 global biodiversity framework requires to leverage such change.

4. This is a time of transition for biodiversity on a global scale. The recently released Biodiversity Barometer report from the Union for Ethical Biotrading suggests that biodiversity awareness is becoming more mainstream, as the number of consumers aged 16 to 24 who were able to define biodiversity correctly grew 20 per cent, compared to 10 per cent growth in awareness across all those surveyed. Focal points for the Convention on Biological Diversity and related stakeholders working to promote the conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity know the value of biodiversity and ecosystem services. But how can these actors continue to increase awareness of the value of biodiversity among policymakers and the public? How can these multi-stakeholder groups transform thinking and create transformational change?

5. To address these questions, at the request of the Bureau of the Conference of the Parties, the Secretariat organized the Seminar on Transformational Change for the Biodiversity Agenda, informally

known as the third Bogis-Bossey Dialogue for Biodiversity, on the margins of the twenty-second meeting of the Subsidiary Body on Scientific, Technical, and Technological Advice and the second meeting of the Subsidiary Body on Implementation, in July 2018. The Third Bogis-Bossey Dialogue on Biodiversity was convened for a wider group of participants from all Parties and observers to share insights about innovative actions that can accelerate change and transform the biodiversity agenda leading to 2020 and beyond.

6. The third Bogis-Bossey Dialogue for Biodiversity built on the participatory roadmap for the post-2020 global biodiversity framework, as well as on the two previous Bogis-Bossey dialogues, organized by the Secretariat with the support of the Government of Switzerland, to discuss biodiversity in the context of transformative change. Executive summaries of the reports on the first and second Bogis-Bossey dialogues for biodiversity were provided as information documents CBD/SBSTTA/21/INF/19 and CBD/SBI/2/INF/35.

I. OBJECTIVE OF THE THIRD BOGIS-BOSSEY DIALOGUE FOR BIODIVERSITY

7. The objective of the third Bogis-Bossey Dialogue for Biodiversity was first to share with Parties to the Convention and its observers, as well as other stakeholder groups, the theoretical framework of sustainability transitions research as a starting point for a strategic examination of pathways for action. Second, it sought to reflect on the steps in the process, including pathways for the acceleration of sustainability transitions in the biodiversity agenda, drawing on examples from the energy sector as well as factors in fostering transformation in the process under the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC). Third, the discussions focused on how the fourth industrial revolution could be harnessed for nature, mindful of interconnected risks and opportunities harnessed through technologies and innovations that are rapidly changing the world.

8. With this framing, the seminar sought to generate an exchange of views and to receive further insights from Parties, observer Governments and other relevant stakeholders, on the framework of sustainability transitions research, and steps to accelerate pathways transitions in the biodiversity agenda, as a complement to the preparations for a post-2020 global biodiversity framework.

9. As delegates prepared for the week of negotiations during the second meeting of the Subsidiary Body on Implementation, the Dialogue provided the opportunity to critically reflect on how the post-2020 agenda can facilitate transformative change. During the second meeting of the Subsidiary Body on Implementation, Parties had before them a note by the Executive Secretary introducing several proposals for a comprehensive and participatory process for the preparation of the post-2020 framework (CBD/SBI/2/17). Additionally, information document CBD/SBI/2/INF/26 provided more information on transitions and transformative change, building on the concepts discussed during the Bogis-Bossey dialogue series.

10. The following report summarizes the presentations, discussions, and outcomes of the third Bogis-Bossey Dialogue on Biodiversity. The discussion can be followed on Twitter at: #BBDDialogue2018.

II. THIRD BOGIS BOSSEY DIALOGUE FOR BIODIVERSITY

11. Building on the momentum and outputs of the first and second Bogis-Bossey dialogues for biodiversity, held in Switzerland in November 2017 and March 2018, respectively, the Secretariat of the Convention on Biological Diversity convened the third Bogis-Bossey Dialogue for Biodiversity, called “Seminar on Transformational Change for the Biodiversity Agenda”, at the request of the Bureau of the Conference of the Parties. The third Dialogue took place on 8 July 2018 on the margins of the twenty-second meeting of the Subsidiary Body on Scientific, Technical, and Technological Advice and the second meeting of the Subsidiary Body on Implementation, with the generous support of the Government of Switzerland.

12. The third Dialogue brought together over 100 participants, including Party representatives, representatives of Presidencies of the Conference of the Parties to the Convention, representatives of indigenous peoples and local communities, youth, relevant United Nations organizations, and other stakeholders involved in the work of the Convention.

A. Session 1: Welcoming remarks and setting the scene

13. Cristiana Paşca-Palmer, Executive Secretary of the Convention on Biological Diversity, welcomed participants and set the objectives for the Dialogue. She said that the intention of the dialogue was to open a broad and inclusive space for discussion into what transformative change meant for biodiversity, and to reflect on the systemic transitions that would be necessary to provide sustainable development and well-being for 9 billion people while remaining within the ecological limits of the Planet.

14. In her presentation, she introduced three ideas to set the context for the Dialogue. First, she highlighted the work on scenario modelling presented in the fourth edition of the *Global Biodiversity Outlook*, which clearly indicated that continuing with a “business as usual” approach would lead to a dramatic loss of biodiversity by 2050, triggering major negative consequences for human well-being. The data presented in the *Global Biodiversity Outlook* had been reinforced by diverse independent reviews. The regional assessments carried out by the Intergovernmental Science-Policy Platform on Biodiversity and Ecosystem Services (IPBES) indicated that further economic growth could facilitate sustainable development only if it was decoupled from the degradation of biodiversity. Likewise, the World Economic Forum’s *Global Risks Report* listed ecological collapse, together with biodiversity loss, among the top global risks in terms of impact for 2018. Ecological resilience research was also indicating that several planetary boundaries had already been crossed, with numerous others at risk of being crossed. Reviewing relevant data, the Subsidiary Body on Scientific, Technical, and Technological Advice at its twenty-second meeting had noted that, despite progress in some areas of the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020, progress was uneven across countries and regions, and, in some cases, insufficient to achieve many Aichi Targets. Reflecting on these diverse studies, the Executive Secretary explained that she believed it was reasonable to worry about not making enough progress in changing the tide and bending the curve for biodiversity loss.

15. Presenting data on the prevalence of climate change and biodiversity in the media over the past 25 years as a “reality check”, the Executive Secretary asked participants a series of questions: Should we even attempt to close the gap in media coverage of climate change and biodiversity? Is this a benchmark for us to determine where we want to move from here? Why are we not relevant to the media?

16. She then highlighted the interconnection between biodiversity and the sustainable development agendas. Despite the fact that numerous reports from the Convention on Biological Diversity, UNDP, and SwedBio at Stockholm Resilience Centre, among others, showed that biodiversity and ecosystems underlie all social and economic systems, forming the core of sustainable development, biodiversity remained marginalized. She asked how much biodiversity was taken on board when development plans were being defined and how many ministers of finance and planning, or businesses, worried about the impact, current and future, that economic development had on these valuable resources. Referencing the decisions on mainstreaming adopted at the thirteenth meeting of the Conference of the Parties as a step in the right direction, she nonetheless questioned how Parties and other stakeholders could ensure that those decisions were implemented, and whether mainstreaming would be enough to stem the tide of biodiversity loss.

17. The Executive Secretary closed with a call for participants, as a community of biodiversity champions, to inspire one another and engage together to energize the dialogue, encourage ideas, and reinforce a spirit of collaboration, transparency and inclusiveness as stakeholders worked together to create the post-2020 global biodiversity framework. She said that humanity was at a critical juncture where humans might, through their actions, undermine their very existence. The window within which to act was narrowing. The actions taken in the next two years leading to 2020 would define the future of mankind. The post-2020 framework could make or break the 2050 Vision to live in harmony with nature and safeguard life on earth.

18. Ms. Edda Fernández Luiselli, Director General for the Primary Sector and Renewable Natural Resources in the Ministry of Environment and Natural Resources (SEMARNAT) of Mexico, followed the Executive Secretary with brief opening remarks on behalf of Mr. Rafael Pachiano Alamán, Minister of Environment and Natural Resources of Mexico and current President of the Conference of the Parties. Explaining that the Dialogue would be addressing the opportunities of transformational change in

biodiversity conservation and sustainable use, she emphasized that transformational change was a complete change in organizational design that was holistic, facilitated deviation from institutional norms, relied on agents of change, and required consideration of the past in the course of planning for the future. The creation of that type of change required trust, respect, courage, focus and commitment. The global community had already made numerous commitments and put into place the policies to achieve them. What was lacking was a common language to align and join the efforts of all relevant sectors. She highlighted the mainstreaming agenda as a potential means to align diverse sectors and facilitate transformational change. She closed with a question to those gathered: “Do we have the will to make the right decisions?”

19. Mr. Norbert Baerlocher, Head of Rio Conventions, Federal Office for the Environment of Switzerland, welcomed participants and shared the motivation of Switzerland in supporting the Bogis-Bossey Dialogue series. For the Government of Switzerland, the fourth edition of the *Global Biodiversity Outlook* served as a strong wake-up call that a “business as usual” was no longer sufficient; the Bogis-Bossey dialogues were meant to serve as a mechanism to encourage reflection and facilitate change. The first Bogis-Bossey Dialogue, which had brought together experts from United Nations agencies, non-governmental organizations, and academic institutions, as well as a limited number of Parties, had encouraged out-of-the-box thinking. The second Bogis-Bossey Dialogue, which had included the Bureau of the Conference of the Parties for its fourteenth meeting, representatives of Presidencies of the Conference of the Parties, and government experts, as well as outside experts, had focused on bringing the ideas generated during the first dialogue to Parties. Baerlocher highlighted that those present, as a global community, needed to be open and brave to make the decisions needed. He highlighted that change required not only ideas but also the energy and strength necessary to provide direction for action. The third Bogis-Bossey Dialogue for Biodiversity, therefore, had been designed to create structure for working with delegates to take action to enhance implementation.

B. Session 2: TED-style talks

20. Session 2 stimulated discussion through short, TED-style talks on key ideas presented during the earlier Bogis-Bossey dialogues. Mr. Halldor Thorgeirsson, Senior Director for Intergovernmental Affairs, UNFCCC Secretariat, opened the session with a presentation on the unfolding story of the ongoing paradigm shift in the climate process. He emphasized that, although the Convention on Biological Diversity community could draw inspirations and learn from the events leading to the signing of the Paris Agreement, the climate process could not be copied. This type of paradigm shift, he contended, was context-specific and took time. Thorgeirsson discussed three entry points that were essential to instigating a paradigm shift in the climate process.

21. First, a realization of the scale and depth of transformation needed on climate was essential. Addressing climate change was not possible by fine-tuning existing systems; it required transformational change. To achieve this required shifting the relationship between the policy community and the political community to be fit for purpose. The international legal framework underlying UNFCCC was strong, but decisions leading up to the twenty-first session of the Conference of the Parties, in Paris, had failed to develop the needed understanding and political will at the national level. Structured, in-depth dialogues between the policy community and the political community in the run-up to the Paris Agreement focused on how much global risk was morally acceptable, recognizing that climate risk was not evenly distributed around the world. From a United Nations perspective, that could not be a decision taken by the most powerful nations – the most vulnerable also had to be at the table.

22. Those discussions, Thorgeirsson emphasized, highlighted the importance of distinguishing between necessity and feasibility. Feasibility was determined by looking backwards – if something had never been done, then it was seen as impossible. Necessity, in contrast, was a moral judgment that looked forward at what needed to be done to survive. The Paris Agreement to limit planetary warming to 2°C leapt into the unknown; it was not done because everyone knew how to do it but because it was necessary for the survival of life on Earth.

23. Thorgeirsson then explained that recognizing the need to change the leadership model was essential. Previously, efforts to address climate change were seen as the domain of governments and economic incentives. In contrast, the Global Climate Action Agenda now sought to catalyse action by all actors at all levels. The Secretary-General's Global Climate Action Summit in 2014 was a key turning point to catalyse the shift from governmental responsibility to multi-stakeholder responsibility. Several elements were essential to provoking this shift, including: elevating the importance of climate change by securing political champions; developing the Action Agenda to emphasize cooperation; and bringing climate change down to the personal level by discussing such topics as clean air, liveable cities, access to modern energy services, and nature conservation.

24. Thorgeirsson emphasized that bringing in new stakeholders was not a substitute for national action, but that it enabled leaders to see that they were not alone – their subnational governments and business were behind them. At the same time, he emphasized that the most difficult point was working with governments to let go of exclusive ownership of the climate agenda. In order to facilitate movement at the subnational and business levels, it was essential to allow them to join the table in equal footing.

25. Finally, Thorgeirsson highlighted that building ambition over time was imperative. The long-term global ambition was now clear: to re-establish balance between global CO₂ emissions and global CO₂ removals and to align finance flows towards low emissions. Working towards this goal had required both top-down and bottom-up processes. The first global stocktake was to conclude in 2023. To facilitate work towards this, later that year, the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) would deliver an assessment on warming of 1.5°C that would feed into the bottom-up Talanoa Dialogue, an inclusive dialogue co-led by the Governments of Fiji and Poland that used the consultative tradition of the Pacific. Together, these top-down and bottom-up processes would need to come together to provide a mechanism for delivering on the target set by the Paris Agreement.

26. In closing, Thorgeirsson emphasized that the Paris Agreement was the beginning of a long journey, not the end goal. The Paris Agreement provided a unity of purpose and clarity for a strategic shift, but the climate community was still in this paradigm shift; there was no room for complacency. He also called for UNFCCC and CBD to work more closely together, capitalizing on key synergies between their mandates and areas of expertise. Whereas UNFCCC knew how to decarbonize the energy supply, Thorgeirsson contended, it lacked expertise to understand nature-based solutions to climate change mitigation and adaptation. The CBD community brought this knowledge. This key synergy between the two conventions offered a way to move forward together.

27. Mr. Derk Loorbach, Director, Dutch Institute of Transitions (DRIFT), gave the second talk on the subject “Mainstreaming or transformation? Biodiversity in transition”. Loorbach emphasized his role as the outsider bringing new ideas and theoretical frameworks on transition management and transformational change to Parties to the Convention on Biological Diversity through the Bogis-Bossey dialogue series.

28. He emphasized that, despite the efforts of the Convention on Biological Diversity and related stakeholders, biodiversity loss was continuing at unprecedented rates. He said that he felt that those gathered in that room could not safeguard life on Earth alone. To date, science and policy processes focussed predominantly on reducing biodiversity loss and institutional ways to make economic development “less bad”. In that way, a dominant science-policy-society system had developed that mitigated a symptom of unsustainability rather than addressing the underlying causes. In contrast, he contended, addressing the fundamental problem – unsustainable economic development – required new approaches.

29. Referencing decisions taken by the Subsidiary Body on Scientific, Technical, and Technological Advice at its twenty-first meeting, Loorbach highlighted that transitional change was desired by Parties to Convention. But, when transformational change was discussed, what was actually meant? Loorbach shared insights from DRIFT studies of transitions in diverse sectors to provide theoretical context for how transitions in the biodiversity agenda could lead to a more sustainable future.

30. Loorbach defined transitions as: “a process of structural, non-linear systemic change in the dominant system that takes place over a period of decades”. He emphasized that humans could not control whether transitions happen or not. Transitions are complex, uncertain, and cannot be managed or predicted in a traditional way. However, he argued that the conditions for transitions are favourable in the coming decade due to the fact that:

(a) Global societal pressures for change are higher than ever, including global institutional pressures and commitments, awareness, ecological crises, and geopolitical concerns;

(b) Industry structures associated with traditional economies are showing internal tensions, such as the energy sector, the mobility sector and agriculture;

(c) There is a global diffusion of alternative social and technological innovations, such as new practices and lifestyles, renewable technologies, platform economies, visions of sustainable futures, and cooperative models.

31. Loorbach introduced the “x-curve” as a model for understanding transition. He explained that the bottom left side of the diagram highlighted societal transitions that were happening. While those emerging alternatives had the potential to be disruptive, they also offered the possibility to move towards more desirable outcomes more rapidly than from within the existing system. The top left of the diagram showed our “normal” societal institutions and traditions, which we typically improved gradually through consensus building within the existing regime. As the new alternatives highlighted in the bottom left developed, however, the existing regime became destabilized. For those in that regime, it could feel like chaos at both the personal and institutional levels as what they had done for years was suddenly being questioned. For example, the fossil energy sectors had traditionally been viewed as working hard to provide the energy needed to power modern society; now, they had become a “dirty” industry responsible for environmental destruction. The top right of the diagram showed the emerging new regime. That would be a recombination of the elements of the old regime that were still deemed useful to keep as well as the innovations from the new system that could transform our societal norms in positive ways. As the new regime was built, it would be important to create coalitions among those elements of the old regime and the elements of new alternatives. The bottom right represented elements of the old regime that needed to be phased out.

32. Loorbach emphasized that there was a biodiversity transition taking place in the way biodiversity conservation and sustainable use was understood, organized and practised. It affected the way biodiversity was communicated, analysed and engaged with. The biodiversity transition was also driven by broader landscape changes emerging through transitions in national sectors. However, thus far, it lacked a clear guiding mission and pathway. To facilitate that transition, it was necessary to find ways to institutionalize practices, culture and structures that supported an economy based on social and ecological boundaries. We likewise needed to engage actors working in related sectors of agriculture, fisheries, forestry, energy, mining, infrastructure, and manufacturing and processing to identify new best practices that were emerging that could contribute to sustainability at the global level.

33. Loorbach introduced several principles for consideration to enhance transition governance, highlighting that this must focus on radical change in the long term while embracing diplomatic solutions in the short term. In transitions, governance had to:

- Be systematic: engaging with emerging dynamics across society levels;
- Be selective: focusing on change agents to create transformative networks;
- Utilize back-casting: drawing on scenarios as instruments for change;
- Be adaptive: experimenting towards multiple goals and transition pathways;
- Facilitate learning by doing and doing by learning: ensuring monitoring and reflexivity.

34. He likewise emphasized the importance of transition governance that integrated top-down and bottom-up processes to change the existing dominant regime, build new alternatives, and phase out elements that were no longer appropriate. There was no generic solution for all sectors. Rather, it was

necessary to create the space for a radical long-term vision that could support embedded, bottom-up sustainability transitions embedded in the local context.

35. As the Convention on Biological Diversity and its stakeholders moved towards the fifteenth meeting of the Conference of the Parties, in Beijing, Mr. Loorbach emphasized a process approach as essential to build the foundation for a transformative post-2020 global biodiversity framework. He advocated building transition teams that would build connections between entrepreneurial policymakers, transition experts and local knowledge-holders. Those transition teams would then conduct a transition analysis by mapping local risk and dynamics that could foster transitions. Those analyses would set the basis for transition arenas that set transformative ambitions for biodiversity-relevant sectors and map the pathways and intermediate goals necessary to achieve those ambitions. Finally, transition experiments would involve collaborative interventions to accelerate transition and to foster social learning and empowerment. As one of example of an area where this was already occurring, he highlighted the shift towards a circular economy in the Netherlands.

36. Loorbach closed by emphasizing that the global community was at a moment of transition. If it was not possible to change course over the next seven or eight years, the Earth and human systems would be hit by the consequences. He stressed that those gathered in the room were not alone – there were diverse actors working at local, national, and global scales to transition towards more sustainable pathways. To create transformational change in the biodiversity agenda, it would be essential to foster the development of networks among these diverse actors.

37. Mr. Dominic Waughray, Head of Public-Private Partnerships, World Economic Forum (World Economic Forum), closed Session 2 with a presentation on the landscape of global risks and global opportunities for transforming the biodiversity agenda. As an international organization for public-private collaboration, the World Economic Forum addressed complex problems that required multiple stakeholders – including challenges related to trade, jobs, and increasingly, issues of biodiversity, climate change, and the global commons.

38. Contributing to the framing of the Dialogue provided by the previous speakers, Mr. Waughray spoke about the World Economic Forum's *Global Risks Report*, a document produced by experts and decision-makers from around the world to identify and analyse the most pressing risks faced by humanity. As the pace of global change accelerated, and as risk interconnections deepened, the 2018 *Global Risks Report* highlighted the growing strain that was being placed on many of the global systems upon which human relied.

39. As part of their analysis, the World Economic Forum created a global risks landscape, identifying the likelihood of events taking place and their potential impact. For 2018, 8 of the 10 most likely and highly impactful risk events were related to the environment: natural disasters, failure of climate change mitigation and adaptation, biodiversity loss and ecosystem collapse, man-made environmental disasters, large-scale involuntary migration,* food crises,* and water crises.* The important thing about the analysis, Mr. Waughray stressed, was that it was not done by the environmental community; it was done by the economic community. Analyses done by respected economic actors could dramatically increase awareness of the risks of continued environmental decline in the private and financial sectors, leading mainstreaming to become an increasingly important and viable conversation.

40. Looking back over the top risks identified by the *Global Risks Report* over the preceding 10 years, Mr. Waughray highlighted the increasing emergence of environmental issues as the top global risks. As opposed to the economic crisis in 2008, which occurred and was fixed relatively quickly, environmental problems could not be fixed by policymakers alone. Those “wicked” problems had to engage multiple actors – they were too difficult for a single government to confront alone. This data became even more impactful when looking at the interconnections among the various risks. The World Economic Forum's analysis showed how environmental risks (for example climate change mitigation and adaptation) could lead to societal risk (for example large-scale involuntary migration and profound social instability). Compiling that data had the potential to tell a powerful story about the structural risks facing policymakers.

41. After exploring the global risk landscape, Mr. Waughray explored the emerging opportunities offered by technology to address some environmental challenges. The industrial revolutions over the preceding 200 years or more had empowered society to harness the power of mechanical technologies, electrical technologies, and digital technologies. As humanity stood poised on what some were labelling the Fourth Industrial Revolution, a confluence of science and technology connected humankind in a way never thought possible. Artificial intelligence, robotics and biotechnologies offered some of the most significant opportunities but also some of the most significant risks facing the Earth; the pace and complexity of technological change was overwhelming.

42. Looking at emerging technologies, Mr. Waughray emphasized the transformational potential of technologies, such as lab meat and genome sequencing. Lab meat, for one, offered a powerful alternative to the current paradigm of habitat loss and destruction driven by agriculture and livestock. It also offered enough opportunity that China had invested US\$ 300 million into its development. The Earth Biogenome Project, with the goal of mapping, storing and disseminating genetic information about much of life on Earth, likewise offered an intriguing area to bring together science, government and industry, while also benefiting local communities through the Nagoya Protocol.

43. In a world of shifting power and changing landscapes for international governance, Mr. Waughray advocated that systems thinking and a platform approach were core tenets of creating scaled change. This type of approach required a different type of thinking. So-called “transformation maps” created by the World Economic Forum to evaluate environment and natural resource security showed that the same fundamental power imbalances were at the core of many interrelated issues. He provided several examples of how unlikely cross-sectoral alliances had shifted the game and helped to address those power imbalances when it came to addressing deforestation, water security and ocean degradation.

44. The Tropical Forest Alliance, for one, emerged in 2010 in as a temporary vehicle to convene diverse stakeholders to strip deforestation out of key supply chains, lower greenhouse gas emissions, and improve smallholder farming income. Four supply chains – palm oil, beef, soy, and paper and pulp – drove half of the world’s carbon emissions from deforestation. This type of information could build alliances of unlikely partners to address this need – such as the diverse constellation of actors involved in the Tropical Forest Alliance. This collaboration was delivering at a systemic level: it provided a platform whereby nine governments of sub-Saharan Africa that had the most deforestation were able to engage in dialogue with key companies and donor companies to create a guaranteed market for deforestation-free palm oil. As a result, 70 per cent of tropical forested land managed by these nine nations had committed to sustainably sourcing palm oil.

45. Similarly, the 2030 Water Resources Group was a public-private platform to assist governments with national water resource management. When working on water issues, it is essential to bring together diverse stakeholders – including science, indigenous peoples and local communities, and business – who can support the government as custodians of the resource. Assessing water resources offers a tangible way to link nature to economic growth by asking a simple question: will national growth trajectory under business-as-usual go beyond a sustainable level of water usage? This question enables the issue of water security to move outside the realm of hydrologists and water ministries and be elevated to an issue of national security. The Water Resources Group alliance has more than 500 partners. As the public-private trust fund with World Bank investment, it has unlocked more resourcing and financing than ever before for water security.

46. The Friends of Ocean Action, likewise, brought together 50 of the world’s most influential people to identify five things that needed to happen for oceans conservation. One of the action streams arising out of this coalition was the Global Plastic Action Partnership, which brought together the Government of Canada, Coca-Cola, the World Resources Institute, and the World Bank in a premier platform for plastic action.

47. In closing, Mr. Waughray stressed that, as the Convention on Biological Diversity started to think about the post-2020 global biodiversity framework, new approaches to policy and implementation had to be anchored in the context of the interconnected risks and opportunities that were rapidly changing the

world. He concluded with a proposal for action to generate discussion among participants. He pitched the idea of instituting “A new deal for nature” at the fifteenth meeting of the Conference of the Parties, in Beijing in 2020, using back-casting to identify the steps that would be needed to achieve this, including:

- (a) A heads of State summit for “A new deal for nature” in support of the fifteenth meeting of the Conference of the Parties;
- (b) Momentum built during 2018 and 2019, shaped by unprecedented public, private and civil society global action platform that:
 - (i) Produces a major report on the economic case for biodiversity that sets a narrative of opportunity;
 - (ii) Disseminates widely the work of IUCN commissions, IPBES, the fifth edition of the *Global Biodiversity Outlook*, and other key sources;
 - (iii) Is championed by over 100 leaders from the business and investor community;
 - (iv) Triggers a set of key industry sector initiatives building on the mainstreaming decisions emanating from the thirteenth and fourteenth meetings of the Conference of the Parties;
 - (v) Mobilizes cross-cutting systems initiatives on topics such as food systems and health systems;
 - (vi) Spurs the development of targets for the biosphere for business, investors, and cities to use.

48. He closed with a challenge to participants to think critically about the way forward to 2020 and beyond.

C. Session 3: Moderated interactive discussion

49. Session 3 provided participants with the opportunity to pose questions to presenters and comment on the information that had been shared. A central theme of the discussion focused on how the ideas presented during the Bogis-Bossey dialogues could influence the post-2020 global biodiversity framework. Emphasizing the parallels and interlinkages between the climate change and biodiversity spheres, as well as the differences, participants discussed what lessons the Convention on Biological Diversity could glean from the UNFCCC process leading up to the Paris Agreement.

50. It was recommended that simplifying the language used to communicate, as well as focusing on the solutions rather than the problems, was a central strategy used by the climate change community that the biodiversity community could emulate. This approach should not create a superficial narrative, but, rather, focus on the basics, “simplifying as much as possible, but not more.” Focusing on communication in that way provided a foundation for a broader movement that existed outside formal negotiations. Although internal negotiation processes were essential for the Convention on Biological Diversity and UNFCCC alike, it was essential to move beyond agreed language to action on the ground. Participants likewise discussed the high expectations for the fifteenth meeting of the Conference of the Parties, in Beijing, and the commitment of China to work with other delegates and stakeholders to deliver an ambitious post-2020 global biodiversity framework.

51. Comments emphasized that, to achieve a truly transformative agenda, it would not be enough to mainstream biodiversity into other sectors; rather, the essential role of nature in all life on Earth must be widely recognized. It was recommended that steps be taken to scale up the positive impacts of industry and minimize negative impacts across the supply chain, drawing on such models as the “circular economy” that promoted industrial policy shifts tied to environmental outcomes. At the same time, increasing global awareness of biodiversity by focusing on the concrete benefits, including food, water and health, was identified as essential.

52. Finally, it was emphasized that creating the conditions for transformational change was highly important, and that the coming week of negotiations during the second meeting of the Subsidiary Body on Implementation provided an important opportunity to advocate for this. Creating transformational change

had to go beyond new targets; it required creating a movement across all sectors of society. This was inherently difficult as it was a journey into the unknown that was experimental, unpredictable, and engaged with entrenched economic power structures. To create the momentum for change, it was agreed that there was a need to both explicitly involve key decision makers and empower action from the grassroots. Delegates were encouraged to take that spirit of engaging together to foster transformational change into the negotiations over the following week, and on to the fourteenth and fifteenth meetings of the Conference of the Parties.

53. Discussion also highlighted that, thus far, science had not been compelling enough to accelerate action. Participants reflected on whether there was a single issue that the biodiversity community could focus on to encourage awareness and action. Focusing on the issue of plastic pollution, conversation again highlighted the importance of issues that brought the environmental crisis from a planetary to a personal level. In 2017, for example, the most impactful environment analysis was a study documenting the level of microplastics in tap water that showed that billions of people globally were drinking water contaminated by plastic pollution. By making the problem personal, this study galvanized action. Participants noted that once individuals had gotten involved through one such “entry issue”, it was easier for them to then embrace similar issues.

54. Some participants contended that it would be important not only to focus on better communication, but on truly enacting change. A key way to do this, they advocated, was by creating space for bottom-up action around access to clean water, access to food security, and access to health care. Once action began to take place, a story for nature would then be told through businesses, platforms and communities. Other participants questioned what it would take to create this change, citing a recent survey conducted in 10 developing countries that had found that, although the majority of people said that they felt personally responsible for biodiversity conservation, 60 per cent said that they expected a greater response from business and government.

55. Although mainstreaming had been identified as a critical vehicle for transformation across sectors, some participants identified the difficulty of implementing mainstreaming in developing economies. One Party, for example, cited that the high economic priority placed on agriculture for their national development left little space for implementing commitments under the Convention on Biological Diversity. One of the national focal points appealed to the Secretariat to provide guidance and support for how to work across ministries and address the strong economic interests pushing for agricultural development. This continual loss of habitat, for example, had led numerous charismatic megafauna to be facing extinction in the focal point’s country. Participants and presenters alike agreed and reflected that this was at the heart of many challenges faced by the Convention. At the global level, trade-offs were often discussed as generalities, but being able to provide support to a Party facing a specific issue on the front lines was essential to shift the trajectory of biodiversity loss.

56. It was suggested that there needed to be a stronger narrative to mobilize political will at the national level, so that focal points for the Convention on Biological Diversity were not battling against people growing food. The difference between the national biodiversity strategies and action plans (NBSAPs) of the Convention on Biological Diversity and nationally determined contributions of UNFCCC was highlighted, with the observation that nationally determined contributions were quite shallow but they had better mobilized political will. It was suggested that identifying a general direction for the negotiations at the fifteenth meeting of the Conference of the Parties that would shift the bar at the national level without being too detail-oriented might be the key to galvanizing political support.

57. In addition to this top-down approach based on encouraging buy-in from key political leaders, it was also emphasized that bottom-up action could provide new alternatives. Creating coalitions across a wide variety of actors to promote economic transition away from monoculture agriculture, for example, can build momentum and opportunities for sustainability transitions from the bottom-up.

58. Another key line of dialogue focused on how the Convention on Biological Diversity could ensure widespread engagement within formal processes to support transformational change. One participant emphasized a major weakness within the Convention on Biological Diversity is that negotiations,

NBSAPs, and national reports are still very much government-owned. It was recommended to establish participatory processes at the national level to target issues in a more integrated way and ensure that diverse stakeholders held ownership over Convention on Biological Diversity commitments.

59. In particular, several participants referenced the role of indigenous peoples and local communities in safeguarding and sustainably using biodiversity. The *Local Biodiversity Outlook*, produced in 2016, showcases the prominent contribution of action by indigenous peoples and local communities towards the Aichi Biodiversity Targets. Participants underlined the importance of placing indigenous peoples and local communities at the centre of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework and ensuring that efforts were not focused exclusively on power actors.

60. This was particularly important when it came to power asymmetries in access and ability to use new tools and technology. As many of the TED-style talks focused on technological developments, some participants cautioned that it will be important to also embrace the traditional knowledge of indigenous peoples and local communities who live and safeguard nature in the most biodiverse areas of the planet. Engaging with people, enabling equal access to new technologies, and developing local, innovative, nature-based solutions would be essential.

61. Other participants raised the question of how processes under the Convention on Biological Diversity could ensure the full engagement of all non-State actors, including business, youth, the health sector, the finance sector, and others, to ensure they are invested in collective goals. One suggestion was to use social network analysis to identify gaps and linkages within the biodiversity community in order to catalyse work towards transformative change. The role of youth was highlighted, in particular the perspective of youth about long-term conservation of nature and the issue of intergenerational equity. Although it was clear that not all millennials were interested in saving the world, there were clear champions for change from different generations; building intergenerational alliances for transformational change could bring together a diversity of perspectives, skills and approaches.

62. It was likewise noted that such platforms as the Tropical Forest Alliance or the Water Resources Group provided a key mechanism to inspire corporate engagement because risk was shared and commitment is collaborative. No corporation will make this commitment alone, especially small and medium enterprises that must garner profit through modest entrepreneurial efforts. As a result, creating the space for collective engagement was particularly essential. Consumer-facing corporations that were exposed to consumers, particularly millennial consumers, had also responded much more quickly to enhancing business model sustainability.

63. To address concerns about inclusivity, it was suggested that diverse representation on steering committees and governing bodies could provide a key mechanism. The Tropical Forest Alliance's steering committee, for example, includes two representatives of indigenous peoples. By ensuring that indigenous peoples and local communities, youth, business, and other sectors were included in leadership roles in the Convention on Biological Diversity and other supportive processes, engagement and commitment could be better galvanized across stakeholder groups. Whatever action was taken, it had to be done with awareness of the asymmetries of power and varying influences among actors. International forums that did not address those imbalances lost not only their credibility but also their ability to affect transformative change.

64. A final theme of the discussion explored what transformational change should actually look like. Presenters emphasized that it was no longer possible to address the global biodiversity crisis by optimizing or fine-tuning; if humanity's impact on the planet was not fundamentally shifted, all life on Earth would suffer the consequences. This was no longer about saving elephants and rhinos – and other charismatic megafauna – it was about whether humanity and other life on Earth would have food to eat and water to drink.

65. One participant noted that her work was more than a job, it was a commitment to provide safe harbour between the government and local activist groups. She saw her role as an educator and partnership builder, sharing the goals of biodiversity-related conventions, and engaging people to create change on the

ground. To do this, however, she found it necessary to work a full day in the office to meet her administrative requirements and to engage in the evenings to build community capacity. Often, existing systems hampered rather than facilitating transformative change, requiring leaders to go “above and beyond”. Participants asked: how can we reconfigure our existing institutional frameworks so success comes because of the framework rather than despite it?

66. Participants queried presenters about the relationship between the existing Aichi Biodiversity Targets and transformational change, as well as the relationship between mainstreaming and transformational change, asking whether current structures could lead to the type of change needed. Presenters emphasized that progress was being made towards the Aichi Biodiversity Targets and towards the mainstreaming agenda, emphasizing the importance of acknowledging that action was happening already. At the same time, it was highlighted that the Convention was not a goal in itself, but a means to an end. The negotiation structures under the Convention provided important clarity at the global level, but they had to translate into collective action on the ground.

67. “Nothing is enough. We need to be impatient. And this impatience needs to be channelled into something,” one presenter noted. “Why leap into the unknown?”, he asked in the context of the dramatic shifts needed to catalyse transformative change. “Because where you are is even worse.” Transformational change would happen irrespective of whether it was supported by negotiations under the Convention on Biological Diversity because the stakes were too high: the world had passed too many tipping points to continue the current trajectory. The direction of the change, however, was up to humanity: it could be catastrophic or it could lead towards more sustainable societies. As another presenter noted: “Change seems to happen to slowly, and then faster than you ever thought possible.”

D. Session 4: Closing remarks

68. Ms. Cristiana Paşca-Palmer, Executive Secretary of the Convention on Biological Diversity, provided reflections in closing on the day’s conversations and about the Bogis-Bossey Dialogue series. Looking back on the motivations leading to the First Dialogue, she emphasized that as a new Executive Secretary working towards delivery of the 2011-2020 Strategic Plan for Biodiversity and the creation of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework, she had been confronted by numerous reports and data sources highlighting that it was not possible to continue with the “business as usual” operations that shaped the Convention’s first 25 years. As a systems ecologist, Paşca-Palmer was interested in exploring how systems thinking could generate disruptive ideas and out of the box thinking to catalyse action on the biodiversity agenda.

69. The first Bogis-Bossey Dialogue for Biodiversity had brought together experts and a limited number of Parties to jumpstart this creative thinking; the second Bogis-Bossey Dialogue for Biodiversity had brought these ideas to Parties and to the Bureau; the third Bogis-Bossey Dialogue for Biodiversity had brought them to the broader body of participants in the Subsidiary Body on Scientific, Technical and Technological Advice and the Subsidiary Body on Implementation.

70. The Executive Secretary reflected on the complexity and rapid pace of change occurring today. “The science tells us that we have very little time – we cannot continue on this same track”, she said. “We need diverse stakeholders and platforms for action. We are all on this Earth, we all have a stake in this. We need to stimulate people’s hearts and minds by knowing the science of this planetary system and translating it into simple language that will inspire those who are not experts.”

71. She emphasized that the answer to the question “why” change tracks was a simple moral and spiritual imperative. Taking action was not just about humanity; it was about all life on Earth. As the dominant species, we have the arrogance that we can influence the future of the planet, but the Earth would outlast us all – it was a complex, dynamic system beyond human control. It was necessary for humanity to approach its work and its actions as a species with humility.

72. How will we change the fate of biodiversity? We have very little time, she stated. She added that the Convention on Biological Diversity’s 2050 Vision of living in harmony with nature was an important and culturally imperative message, but it was not concrete enough to encourage action. It was not possible

to know, for example, what “living in harmony with nature” would be for someone born in 2030. The Executive Secretary emphasized that there must be both a moral dimension of how we approach nature, and a functional dimension that provided concrete steps for action.

73. The Convention on Biological Diversity had 28 months until the fifteenth meeting of the Conference of the Parties, in China, 28 months to think of an architecture for a post-2020 that encompassed both the moral imperative and the concrete steps for action. She emphasized that to develop a transformative post-2020 agenda in that short amount of time would require both formal processes within the Convention and processes pioneered by informal actors to co-create knowledge and action. She proposed that the tools provided by Looibach could offer a mechanism for facilitating actions towards transition if by, 2050, the Earth could be sustainably managed. Using that goal, she suggested that participants use a back-casting approach to identify what actions were needed during the period 2020-2050; doing so necessitated the creation of a preliminary list of elements essential to the post-2020 framework.

74. The Executive Secretary also suggested that, to be more successful in the biodiversity agenda, a central approach would involve simplifying the language and making the solutions more accessible. Even the term “biodiversity”, she contended, was not well understood in comparison with “nature”. She advocated that nature should be presented as the infrastructure that supports life and development. From that base, the Convention on Biological Diversity and its Parties had to identify what messages could be brought to politicians, economic leaders and chief executive officers to facilitate top-down action. “When leadership comes from the top,” the Executive Secretary noted, “we see a lot of change that can otherwise take a long time to happen.” It is essential to couple this type of top-down action with bottom-up action from the grass-roots organizations and individuals.

75. The Executive Secretary concluded with a reflection: “This is about togetherness. Most of you here in the room are from our Parties or from civil society. We will have to do this together. At the same time, if we do not recognize that processes under the Convention are removed from mainstream economic development, we will not succeed in the short amount of time we have”. She suggested that the conversations for the post-2020 framework cannot only focus on what the next set of targets will be, but, rather, must address the question of how to initiate transformational change. “There is a huge job ahead of us. The Secretariat stands ready to support, but believe that the process is truly about multi-stakeholder collaboration for transformative change. We cannot do it alone.”
