

Views expressed in Plenary on potential elements of the structure and scope of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework (agenda item 4)

CLUSTER 3 – PLANNING AND ACCOUNTABILITY MODALITIES, MECHANISMS AND TOOLS (MONITORING, REPORTING, REVIEW)

Addressed in the afternoon of the first day, and morning of second day, 38 statements were made on “Cluster 3” by the following Parties to the Convention: Côte d’Ivoire (on behalf of Africa), Norway, Tajikistan, European Union, Ghana, New Zealand, Indonesia, Mexico, Japan, Moldova, Georgia, Switzerland, Canada, Chile, China, Australia, Democratic Republic of Congo, Ethiopia, Egypt, Bolivia, Ecuador, Eswatini, Uganda, Philippines, South Sudan, Mauritania, Cuba, Burkina Faso, Colombia, Eritrea, Namibia, Lebanon, Togo, and Saint Lucia.

Statements were also made on “Cluster 3” by the following organizations: GYBN, UNU, CBD Women’s Caucus, CBD Alliance (on behalf of FOEI, Action Aid, ICCAC)

General matters

Areas of convergence

The global biodiversity framework should include an implementation and review mechanism and a solid accountability and transparency framework.

Review process should be technical, objective, transparent, and facilitate enhanced efforts by Parties; it should help Parties to share their experiences and learn from one another.

Should be based on high-quality national reports.

Planning and accountability and review are closely related to cluster 2 as resources are necessary for effective planning, monitoring, reporting and implementation. Accountability should also apply to enabling conditions and means of implementation.

Ensure effective, meaningful and inclusive participation of indigenous peoples and local communities, women, youth and civil society organizations, especially those working on conservation and human rights issues.

Areas proposed for amendments/refinement or requiring further development/consideration

As the global biodiversity framework will be a framework for biodiversity beyond the CBD, the accountability and review mechanism should be developed in coordination with the MEAs.

Monitoring and review should be classified into three categories – national, regional, international.

Accountability mechanisms need to be applied to all relevant actors and sectors that use and benefit from biodiversity, including the private sector.

Accountability needs to be applied from the notion of common but differentiated responsibilities, considering historical and current responsibilities.

Multi-actor participation is key to transparency and accountability.

Establishing smart targets for the post-2020 framework will be critical. It is also necessary to establish baselines and indicators to demonstrate global progress.

“Implementation instruments” should be added to the title of this cluster.

National biodiversity strategies and action plans

Areas of convergence

NBSAPs should remain the main instrument for implementation of the Convention.

NBSAPs should be revised in line with the new framework in order to allow comparability and assessment of progress at regional and global levels. This should be done quickly, focusing only on necessary areas, in order to retain a focus on implementation.

Areas of divergence

Revision of NBSAPs should be kept to a minimum, or not done at all.

Areas proposed for amendments/refinement or requiring further development/consideration

NBSAPs should be made more dynamic and responsive to future updates of SP

Strengthen measurability of global and national targets establishing clear indicators.

Better align global, national, subnational planning and reporting.

NBSAPs need to be better aligned with the global biodiversity framework and their quality needs to be improved.

NBSAPs need to be standardized to improve transparency and comparability.

National reports

Areas of convergence

National reports should remain principal reporting mechanism. However national reports (process, format, platform and contents) should be improved upon.

National reports are fundamental role in accountability and should be basis for any additional review processes developed under the global biodiversity framework.

SMART targets and indicators are essential for effective reporting.

Content of national reports should be clearly tied to the global biodiversity framework.

Reporting to the Convention and Protocols should be harmonized.

National reporting format should be further streamlined and harmonized with reports to MEAs.

Should report against a standard set of global biodiversity indicators.

Areas of divergence

-

Areas proposed for amendments/refinement or requiring further development/consideration

Continuity of implementation as well as outcomes of the efforts should be assessed in national reports.

National reports need to be comparable with each other.

National reports should only be due in 2030; another simpler report identifying difficulties and gaps could be submitted in the middle term.

It is necessary to report on elements related to cluster 2 and to identify a more adequate modality for reporting on progress in addressing underlying drivers.

Reporting on women and IPLCs should not be a voluntary section of the report.

Review process

Areas of convergence

A review process for stepping up implementation is essential.

Protocols should be included in the review process.

Comprehensive monitoring is key to the review mechanism.

Areas of divergence

Establishment of a compliance committee to ensure timely reporting and accountability.

Areas proposed for amendments/refinement or requiring further development/consideration

Periodic or cyclical reviews linked to other intergovernmental processes should be considered.

A review mechanism should not demand more time or resources from Parties as they should focus on implementation.

Review should include sound evaluation of effectiveness of policy instruments and measures.

Need effective monitoring to support comprehensive reporting to form a solid basis for review.

Need good indicators to have a good review mechanism; revise the list of indicators striving for a set containing more simple indicators that are harmonized with the indicators used by IPBES or for the Sustainable Development Goals.

Draw from procedures of the United Nations human rights system's universal periodic review.

Reports prepared by stakeholders and rights-holders serve as official reference for future accountability and a compliance mechanism.

It is important that any monitoring, reporting or review process or mechanism: (a) have benchmarks and clear goal(s); (b) allow for comparability or assessment; (c) be regularly conducted; (d) be accompanied by regular, reliable and sustained financial and capacity-building support; (e) be periodically reviewed and amended if necessary.

Parties should discuss the results of national reports in order to learn from one another as in voluntary peer review.

Voluntary commitments

Areas of convergence

There is general support for voluntary national commitments, including those from non-State actors.

Should be additional to commitments already in NBSAPs (and may subsequently be included in NBSAPs as they are updated).

The notion of voluntary commitments needs to be further clarified and thought needs to go into how they would be captured in national biodiversity plans, reported on and reviewed as part of the accountability framework.

Areas of divergence

Should be included in NBSAPs.

Should not be part of obligations under the Convention.

Should not be voluntary; should be in addition to NBSAPs.

Voluntary commitments should be part of cluster 2 as they are about committing resources.

Voluntary commitments from non-State actors should be dealt at the national level.

Areas proposed for amendments/refinement or requiring further development/consideration

Voluntary commitments could spur political momentum. Should be coherent with the updating of NBSAPs and monitoring and review mechanisms for the overall implementation of the new framework.

Establish a modality to ensure ambition, assessment and ratcheting up (if needed).

Should be evidence-based.

Processes for publication, reporting and analysis of the voluntary commitment will be needed. It is necessary to consider the costs of management for a new framework of voluntary commitments in addition to an existing framework of national reports.

Can be important communications and promotion tools.

Voluntary commitments at the regional level could be a fundamental tool for forwarding shared commitments and generating synergies in implementation of the conventions.
