



Convention on Biological Diversity

Distr.
GENERAL

CBD/COP/15/INF/10
11 November 2022

ENGLISH AND SPANISH
ONLY

CONFERENCE OF THE PARTIES TO THE
CONVENTION ON BIOLOGICAL DIVERSITY
Fifteenth meeting – Part II
Montreal, Canada, 7-19 December 2022
Agenda item 16

COMPILATION OF SUBMISSIONS RECEIVED FROM PARTIES ON THE LONG-TERM STRATEGIC APPROACH TO MAINSTREAMING

Note by the Executive Secretary

I. INTRODUCTION

1. In decision 14/3, paragraph 17, the Conference of the Parties decided to establish a long-term strategic approach to mainstreaming biodiversity and, in paragraphs 19 (b) and (c), requested the Executive Secretary to develop it further by working with the Informal Advisory Group on Mainstreaming of Biodiversity established as per paragraph 18 and with the terms of reference provided in annex II to the decision. The result of that work was considered by the Subsidiary Body of Implementation at its third meeting and the outcome of its considerations is reflected in its recommendation 3/15.
2. In paragraph 1 of recommendation 3/15, the Subsidiary Body on Implementation requested the Executive Secretary, subject to the availability of resources, in consultation with the Bureau of the Convention on Biological Diversity, to complete the work under decision 14/3 as follows:
 - (a) To invite Parties, other Governments, indigenous peoples and local communities, relevant stakeholders and partners, to review the long-term strategic approach to mainstreaming biodiversity and its action plan and to submit their views to the Executive Secretary;
 - (b) To prepare a compilation of submissions received and to make it available for consideration by the Conference of the Parties at its fifteenth meeting to support an in-depth Party-driven review of the long-term strategic approach to mainstreaming biodiversity with a view to its finalization.
3. The invitation in paragraph 2 (a) above was communicated to Parties and organizations through notification 2022-025 issued on 21 April 2022, and the Secretariat subsequently received 15 submissions from Parties and 15 from organizations. The present document provides a compilation of views received from Parties on the draft decision text, general comments on the long-term strategic approach to mainstreaming (LTAM) and its action plan, as well as specific comments on each strategy area and headline action of the long-term strategic approach to mainstreaming.¹ The submissions have been reproduced in the form and language in which they were received.
4. The submissions are also available at <https://www.cbd.int/notifications/2022-025>.

¹ Complementary compilations are contained in document CBD/COP/15/INF/11 (views from Parties specifically on the voluntary action plan) and CBD/COP/15/INF/12 (views from organizations).

II. COMPILATION OF COMMENTS

A. Proposals received on the draft decision and related items²

Bolivia (Plurinational State of)

Draft recommendation submitted by the Chair

The Subsidiary Body on Implementation,

Recalling decision 14/3 of the Conference of the Parties, in which it decided to establish a long-term strategic approach to biodiversity mainstreaming, to develop it further with the support of an informal advisory group, and to consider the advice of that informal advisory group on ways to integrate biodiversity mainstreaming adequately into the post-2020 global biodiversity framework,

Welcoming the work of the Informal Advisory Group on Mainstreaming Biodiversity established pursuant to decision 14/3, as reflected in the progress report of the Executive Secretary,¹

Recommends that the Conference of the Parties at its fifteenth meeting adopt a decision along the following lines:

The Conference of the Parties,

Recalling Article 6 (b) of the Convention, which requires Contracting Parties to integrate, as far as possible and as appropriate, the conservation and sustainable use of biological diversity into relevant sectoral or cross-sectoral plans, programmes, and policies,

Reiterating the critical importance of mainstreaming biodiversity across government and society in order to achieve the objectives of the Convention, and the urgent need to mainstream biodiversity in line with the post-2020 global biodiversity framework,

Emphasizing that the work on mainstreaming biodiversity must not promote the commodification of ecosystem functions and services of nature and it should be oriented towards enhancing the harmonic relationship between peoples and nature, while respecting human rights and the rights of Mother Earth.

Emphasizing the importance of intensified mainstreaming action to achieve the transformational change needed in order to attain the 2050 vision, while *acknowledging* the specific challenges faced by developing countries in supporting mainstreaming policies and the need for adequate means of implementation and enhanced international cooperation,

1. *Welcomes* the work of the Informal Advisory Group on Biodiversity Mainstreaming, as reflected in the progress report of the Executive Secretary to the Subsidiary Body on Implementation at its third meeting;²

2. *[Adopts][Takes note of][Welcomes]* the long-term strategic approach to biodiversity mainstreaming, as a nationally voluntary guidance for parties interested to do so, contained in the annex to the present decision as an important contribution to the development of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework;

3. *Invites* Parties and other Governments, at all levels, as well as businesses, civil society, indigenous peoples and local communities, and relevant stakeholders to use the long-term strategic approach to mainstreaming biodiversity as further nationally voluntary guidance tool, for parties interested to do so, in implementing the elements of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework related to biodiversity mainstreaming, as appropriate;

² Comments in this section were based on CBD/SBI/3/CRP.16.

4. [Welcomes] [Takes note] [Takes note with appreciation] of the voluntary action plan for the long-term strategic approach to mainstreaming biodiversity,³ and **(encourages** Parties and other Governments, at all levels, as well as businesses, research and development agencies, civil society, indigenous peoples and local communities, women and youth and relevant stakeholders to take into account this nationally voluntary guidance ~~the catalogue of possible mainstreaming actions,~~ in order to support the global biodiversity framework and its implementation, to be taken at all levels and across Governments, economic sectors and society and through the inclusion of those actions in their revised national biodiversity strategies and action plans, as appropriate);

5. ~~Invites~~~~Requests~~ Parties and *invites* other Governments, willing to do so, at all levels to report their case studies, good practices, lessons learned, and other relevant experiences in implementing the long-term strategic approach and its action plan, as part of their national reports and in the clearing-house mechanism, and *requests* the Executive Secretary to consider this information in upcoming editions of the *Global Biodiversity Outlook* and *Local Biodiversity Outlooks*, including, as appropriate, experiences of indigenous peoples and local communities, business and civil society organizations, as well as other stakeholders;

6. *Recognizes* the work of the Informal Advisory Group and its extended network, taking into account conflicts of interests, and, building on their experience, advice and expertise, *decides* to establish an Ad Hoc Technical Expert Group on the Mainstreaming of Biodiversity to advise the Parties, the Bureau and the Secretariat s the long-term strategic approach and its action plan to biodiversity mainstreaming in support of the global biodiversity framework, and to report on its work to the Subsidiary Body on Implementation at its fourth meeting, including on:

(a) Exchanging and analysing case studies, good practices and lessons learned on, as measures for living in harmony with nature and significant reduction in biodiversity loss, while acknowledging that some countries recognize the rights of Mother Earth;

- (i) Identifying priority mainstreaming actions in sectors with the most significant dependencies and impacts on biodiversity;
- (ii) Ways and means to strengthen the participation, representation, and capacity of civil society in implementing mainstreaming actions, in particular indigenous peoples and local communities, women and youth;
- (iii) Biodiversity criteria metrics, as appropriate, which can be used by businesses and other actors to support the setting of science-based targets, including multiple values of biodiversity, intrinsic values of nature and the rights of Mother Earth;
- (iv) [The needs, costs, benefits and approaches to implementing mainstreaming actions of developing countries, taking into account their specific financial, technical, technological and capacity gaps;]

(b) Collaborating, as appropriate, with the ad hoc technical expert group on monitoring the post-2020 global biodiversity framework to be established in accordance with paragraph 11 of the draft decision on scientific and technical information to support the review of the updated goals and targets, and related indicators and baselines;⁴

(c) Deepening joint collaborative efforts and synergies with the Rio conventions and the biodiversity-related conventions (multilateral environmental agreements), among other relevant conventions, and such treaties as the chemical conventions;⁵

7. *Requests* the Subsidiary Body on Implementation, subject to the arrangements in place for reporting, monitoring and review of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework, to undertake a mid-term review of the long-term strategic approach and the action plan in support of the global biodiversity framework, at one of its meetings prior to the seventeenth meeting of the Conference of the Parties,⁶ reviewing the progress made, challenges encountered, and lessons

learned, taking into account the specific financial, technological and capacity gaps faced by developing countries in supporting mainstreaming policies, and identifying any need for further action on mainstreaming, for consideration by the Conference of the Parties at its seventeenth meeting;

8. *Invites* developed country Parties, and other Governments according to their capabilities, donors, as well as relevant organizations and initiatives, ~~the private sector~~ and multilateral development agencies, to provide financial support for the work of the Ad Hoc Technical Expert Group;

9. *Invites* Parties and *encourages* other Governments, in collaboration with various sectors, to establish, or further strengthen, national, subnational, regional or global platforms ~~business and biodiversity partnerships as institutional partners~~ for the implementation of the long-term strategic approach in accordance with the different visions and approaches of each country to achieve sustainable development, in accordance to their national priorities and circumstances, building on the experience of the Global Partnership for Business and Biodiversity and the Global Business and Biodiversity Forum and associated instruments;

10. *Takes note* ~~with appreciation~~ of the biodiversity mainstreaming strategy of the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations, and *encourages* relevant international organizations and initiatives, as well as global and regional multilateral development banks, to develop their mainstreaming strategies and plans, and/or to strengthen their existing ones, in a manner consistent with the respective mandates and priorities;

11. [~~Welcomes~~][*Takes note of*] the work carried out on mainstreaming under the Cartagena Protocol and the support provided in this regard by the Japan Biodiversity Fund, *encourages* Parties to the Cartagena Protocol and other stakeholders to step up their mainstreaming efforts, building on the long-term strategic approach, and *invites* donors to support such activities;

12. [*Requests* the Global Environment Facility to strengthen mainstreaming in its future programming, and assist Parties in developing and implementing their mainstreaming actions aligned with revised national biodiversity strategies and action plans, building on the long-term strategic approach to mainstreaming biodiversity in accordance with national priorities and circumstances (?);].

13. *Takes note* of the interim report prepared by the United Nations Environment Programme World Conservation Monitoring Centre on building a common view among key stakeholders on the measurement, monitoring and disclosure of corporate impacts and dependencies on biodiversity;

14. *Invites* the United Nations Environment Programme World Conservation Monitoring Centre and collaborating institutions to continue the work with a view to agreeing on a comparable set of measurements for businesses related to the three pillars of the Convention which can be integrated into corporate disclosure and reporting, in line with the set of headline indicators for the global biodiversity framework;

15. *Invites* governments at all levels to regulate business and financial institutions to develop ~~their internal capacity and regulators~~ to measure and integrate, as well as recognize the biodiversity risks, impacts and dependencies of their economic actions, and to provide measurable and verifiable and actionable information using internationally reliable standards for improved decision-making to mainstream biodiversity and the promotion of environmental (including biodiversity), social, cultural and governance standards as appropriate;

16. *Requests* the Executive Secretary, subject to the availability of resources:

(a) To support the work of the Ad Hoc Technical Expert Group as per paragraph 6 above and, in particular, to develop an overview of the status of implementation of the existing

programmes of work as well as potential new programmes of work with potential partners, in consideration of ~~the proposed action plan~~ for the long-term approach to mainstreaming biodiversity⁴ and the updated zero draft of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework;⁸

(b) To continue to cooperate and coordinate, taking into account conflict of interests, with the extended open consultive network of relevant organizations and initiatives working on various elements of the biodiversity mainstreaming agenda, relevant multilateral environmental agreements, including biodiversity-related conventions, the Rio conventions, the hazardous chemicals and wastes conventions, relevant international sectoral organizations and their programmes, other relevant processes, such as the implementation of the programmes of work under the Convention on Biological Diversity, and to continue organizing, in collaboration with relevant global, regional, and thematic organizations and other stakeholders, and in conjunction with capacity building activities, the monitoring and review mechanism of the global biodiversity framework, and resource mobilization tasks and commitments, relevant workshops and forums for discussion and exchange of experiences with respect to mainstreaming of biodiversity in key sectors, further to decision 14/3, paragraph 19(g);

(c) To collaborate with the secretariats of other Rio and biodiversity-related conventions, the Biodiversity Liaison Group, the United Nations Environment Management Group, youth, women, indigenous peoples and local communities and other relevant organizations and stakeholders to optimize synergies among similar initiatives related to mainstreaming and multi-stakeholder cooperation, to propose viable participatory methods, both those based on science, free of conflict of interest and under the precautionary approach, and those that include traditional knowledge, especially those related to the value that biological diversity has for indigenous peoples and local communities, with their consent, and to promote collaboration and conflict resolution among relevant stakeholders with a view to improving environmental governance around biodiversity conservation projects;

(d) To continue to promote and collaborate in the work on business criteria and metrics for biodiversity on the basis of existing as well as emerging tools and approaches, considering the different visions and approaches of each country to achieve sustainable development, in accordance to the conceptual framework of IPBES, and on the definition of strategies for productive sectors in their business decisions in order to integrate biodiversity into their corporate ~~accounting and~~ decision-making frameworks, ensuring their supply chains are accounted for according to international standards and codes of conduct;

(e) To continue to promote, expand and provide support to the Global Partnership for Business and Biodiversity, and its national and regional partnerships, with a view to scaling up these partnerships, to further enhance their effectiveness as a mechanism for engaging businesses and exchanging pertinent experiences and best practices, including through the Global Forum on Business and Biodiversity as a multi-stakeholder platform for exchanges at all levels of governance and with relevant players, and to identify gaps, opportunities, challenges and lessons learned in mainstreaming;

(f) To strengthen the Sharm El-Sheikh to Kunming Action Agenda in order to encourage and catalyse commitments to concretely support the global biodiversity framework, the long-term strategic approach to mainstreaming, and sectoral and societal implementation of biodiversity mainstreaming policies, notably by creating coalitions and communities of practices;

(g) To submit a progress report on these activities, as well as on any other pertinent developments, and include proposals for undertaking the mid-term review of the long-term strategic approach, consistent with the arrangements in place for reporting, monitoring and review of the post2020 global biodiversity framework, for consideration by the Subsidiary Body on Implementation at its fourth meeting.

Canada

Note: Canada's submission also included many comments in "comment balloons", not included below; to view them, please consult the full submission.

Draft recommendation submitted by the Chair

The Subsidiary Body on Implementation,

Recalling decision 14/3 of the Conference of the Parties, in which it decided to establish a long-term strategic approach to biodiversity mainstreaming, to develop it further with the support of an informal advisory group, and to consider the advice of that informal advisory group on ways to integrate biodiversity mainstreaming adequately into the post-2020 global biodiversity framework,

Welcoming the work of the Informal Advisory Group on Mainstreaming Biodiversity established pursuant to decision 14/3, as reflected in the progress report of the Executive Secretary,³

Recommends that the Conference of the Parties at its fifteenth meeting adopt a decision along the following lines:

The Conference of the Parties,

Recalling Article 6 (b) of the Convention, which requires Contracting Parties to integrate, as far as possible and as appropriate, the conservation and sustainable use of biological diversity into relevant sectoral or cross-sectoral plans, programmes, and policies,

Reiterating the critical importance of mainstreaming biodiversity across government and society in order to achieve the objectives of the Convention, and the urgent need to mainstream biodiversity in line with the post-2020 global biodiversity framework,

Emphasizing the importance of intensified mainstreaming action to achieve the transformational change needed in order to attain the 2050 vision, while *acknowledging* the specific challenges faced developing countries, in supporting mainstreaming policies and the need for adequate means of implementation and enhanced international cooperation,

1. *Welcomes* the work of the Informal Advisory Group on Biodiversity Mainstreaming, as reflected in the progress report of the Executive Secretary to the Subsidiary Body on Implementation at its third meeting;⁴

2. *[Adopts][Takes note of][Welcomes]* the long-term strategic approach to biodiversity mainstreaming contained in the annex to the present decision as an important guidance contribution to the development for the implementation of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework;

3. *Invites* Parties and other Governments, at all levels, as well as businesses, civil society, indigenous peoples and local communities, and relevant stakeholders to use the long-term strategic approach to mainstreaming biodiversity as further voluntary guidance tool in implementing the elements of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework related to biodiversity mainstreaming, as appropriate;

4. *[Welcomes] [Takes note] [Takes note with appreciation]* of the voluntary action plan for the long-term strategic approach to mainstreaming biodiversity,⁵ and encourages Parties and other Governments, at all levels, as well as businesses, research and development agencies, civil society, indigenous peoples and local communities, women and youth and relevant stakeholders to take into account the catalogue of possible mainstreaming actions, in order to support the global biodiversity framework and its implementation, to be taken at all levels and across Governments, economic sectors and society and through the inclusion of those actions in their revised national biodiversity strategies and action plans, as appropriate;

5. *Requests* Parties and *invites* other Governments at all levels to report their case studies, good practices, lessons learned, and other relevant experiences in implementing the long term strategic approach and its action plan, as part of their national reports and in the clearing-house mechanism, and *requests* the Executive Secretary to consider this information in upcoming editions of the [*Global Biodiversity Outlook and the Local Biodiversity Outlook*], including, as appropriate, experiences of indigenous peoples and local communities, business and civil society organizations, as well as other stakeholders;

6. *Recognizes* the work of the Informal Advisory Group and its extended network and, building on their experience, advice and expertise, *decides* to establish an Ad Hoc Technical Expert Group on the Mainstreaming of Biodiversity to advise the Parties, the Bureau and the Secretariat on the implementation and review of the long-term strategic approach to biodiversity mainstreaming in support of the global biodiversity framework, and to report on its work to the Subsidiary Body on Implementation at its fourth meeting, including on:

- (a) Exchanging and analysing case studies, good practices and lessons learned on;
 - (i) Identifying priority mainstreaming actions in sectors with the most significant dependencies and impacts on biodiversity;
 - (ii) Ways and means to strengthen the participation, representation, and capacity of civil society in implementing mainstreaming actions;
 - (iii) Biodiversity metrics which can be used by businesses and other actors to support the setting of science-based targets;
 - (iv) [The needs, ~~including costs,~~ benefits and approaches to implementing mainstreaming actions taking in particular account the specific financial, technical, technological and capacity gaps of developing countries, ~~taking into account their specific financial, technical, technological and capacity gaps;~~]
- (b) Collaborating, as appropriate, with the ad hoc technical expert group on monitoring the post-2020 global biodiversity framework to be established in accordance with paragraph 11 of the draft decision on scientific and technical information to support the review of the updated goals and targets, and related indicators and baselines;⁶
- (c) Deepening joint collaborative efforts related to mainstreaming of biodiversity, and synergies with the Rio conventions and the biodiversity-related conventions (multilateral environmental agreements), ~~among other relevant conventions, and such treaties as the chemical conventions;~~

7. *Requests* the Subsidiary Body on Implementation, subject to the arrangements in place for reporting, monitoring and review of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework, to undertake a mid-term review of the long-term strategic approach [and the action plan] in support of the global biodiversity framework, at one of its meetings prior to the seventeenth meeting of the Conference of the Parties,⁷ reviewing the progress made, challenges encountered, and lessons learned, taking into account the specific financial, technological and capacity gaps faced by developing countries in supporting mainstreaming policies, and identifying any need for further action on mainstreaming, for consideration by the Conference of the Parties at its seventeenth meeting;

8. *Invites* ~~developed country~~ Parties, and other Governments according to their capabilities, donors, as well as relevant organizations and initiatives, the private sector and multilateral development agencies, to provide financial support for the work of the Ad Hoc Technical Expert Group;

9. *Invites* Parties and *encourages* other Governments at all levels, in collaboration with various sectors, to establish, or further strengthen, national, subnational, regional or global business and biodiversity partnerships as institutional partners for the implementation of the long-

term strategic approach ~~in accordance with national priorities and circumstances~~, building on the experience of the Global Partnership for Business and Biodiversity and the Global Business and Biodiversity Forum and associated instruments;

10. *Takes note with appreciation* of the biodiversity mainstreaming strategy of the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations, and *encourages* relevant international organizations and initiatives, as well as global and regional multilateral development banks, to develop their mainstreaming strategies and plans, and/or to strengthen their existing ones, in a manner consistent with the respective mandates and priorities;

11. ~~[Welcomes]~~*[Takes note of]* the work carried out on mainstreaming under the Cartagena Protocol and the support provided in this regard by the Japan Biodiversity Fund, *encourages* Parties to the Cartagena Protocol and other stakeholders to step up their mainstreaming efforts, building on the long-term strategic approach, and *invites* donors to support such activities;

12. *[Requests* the Global Environment Facility to strengthen mainstreaming in its future programming, and assist Parties in developing and implementing their mainstreaming actions aligned with revised national biodiversity strategies and action plans, building on the long-term strategic approach to mainstreaming biodiversity in accordance with national priorities and circumstances ⁽⁸⁾];

13. *Takes note* of the interim report prepared by the United Nations Environment Programme World Conservation Monitoring Centre on building a common view among key stakeholders on the measurement, monitoring and disclosure of corporate impacts and dependencies on biodiversity;

14. *Invites* the United Nations Environment Programme World Conservation Monitoring Centre and collaborating institutions to continue the work with a view to agreeing on a comparable set of measurements for businesses related to the three pillars of the Convention which can be integrated into corporate disclosure and reporting, in line with the set of headline indicators for the global biodiversity framework;

15. *Invites* business and financial institutions to develop their internal capacity and regulators to measure and integrate, as well as recognize the biodiversity risks, impacts and dependencies of their economic actions, and to provide measurable and verifiable and actionable information using internationally reliable standards for improved decision-making to mainstream biodiversity and the promotion of environmental (including biodiversity), social, cultural and governance standards as appropriate;

16. *Requests* the Executive Secretary, subject to the availability of resources:

(a) To support the work of the Ad Hoc Technical Expert Group as per paragraph 6 above ~~and, in particular, to develop an overview of the status of implementation of the existing programmes of work as well as potential new programmes of work with potential partners, in consideration of the proposed action plan for the long-term approach to mainstreaming biodiversity⁴ and the updated zero draft of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework;⁹~~

A.bis Further develop and strengthen the action plan for the long-term strategic approach to mainstreaming biodiversity, in collaboration with the Ad Hoc Technical Expert Group for consideration by the Conference of the Parties at its seventeenth meeting;

(b) To continue to cooperate and coordinate with the extended open consultative network of relevant organizations and initiatives working on various elements of the biodiversity mainstreaming agenda, ~~relevant multilateral environmental agreements, including biodiversity-related conventions, the Rio conventions, the hazardous chemicals and wastes conventions, relevant international sectoral organizations and their programmes, other relevant processes, such~~

~~as the implementation of the programmes of work under the Convention on Biological Diversity, and to continue organizing, in collaboration with relevant global, regional, and thematic organizations and other stakeholders, and in conjunction with capacity building activities, the monitoring and review mechanism of the global biodiversity framework, and resource mobilization tasks and commitments, relevant workshops and forums for discussion and exchange of experiences with respect to mainstreaming of biodiversity in key sectors, further to decision 14/3, paragraph 19(g);~~

(c) ~~To collaborate with the secretariats of other Rio and biodiversity-related conventions, the Biodiversity Liaison Group, the United Nations Environment Management Group, youth, women, indigenous peoples and local communities, local and subnational governments and other relevant organizations and stakeholders to optimize synergies among similar initiatives related to mainstreaming and multi-stakeholder cooperation, to propose viable participatory methods, both those based on science, free of conflict of interest and under the precautionary approach, and those that include traditional knowledge, especially those related to the value that biological diversity has for indigenous peoples and local communities, with their free, prior and informed consent, and to promote collaboration and conflict resolution among relevant stakeholders and indigenous peoples, with a view to improving environmental governance around biodiversity conservation projects;~~

(d) To continue to promote and collaborate in the work on business metrics for biodiversity on the basis of existing as well as emerging tools and approaches, and on the definition of strategies for productive sectors in their business decisions in order to integrate biodiversity into their corporate accounting and decision-making frameworks, ensuring their supply chains are accounted for according to international standards and codes of conduct;

(e) To continue to promote, expand and provide support to the Global Partnership for Business and Biodiversity and its national and regional partnerships, with a view to scaling up these partnerships, to further enhance their effectiveness as a mechanism for engaging businesses and exchanging pertinent experiences and best practices, including through the Global Forum on Business and Biodiversity as a multi-stakeholder platform for exchanges at all levels of governance and with relevant players, and to identify gaps, opportunities, challenges and lessons learned related to its mainstreaming;

(f) To ~~promote~~ strengthen the Sharm El-Sheikh to Kunming Action Agenda in order to encourage and catalyse commitments to concretely support the global biodiversity framework, the long-term strategic approach to mainstreaming, and sectoral and societal implementation of biodiversity mainstreaming policies, notably by creating coalitions and communities of practices;

(g) To submit a progress report on these activities, as well as on any other pertinent developments, and include proposals for undertaking the mid-term review of the long-term strategic approach, consistent with the arrangements in place for reporting, monitoring and review of the post2020 global biodiversity framework, for consideration by the Subsidiary Body on Implementation at its fourth meeting.

United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland

A. Comments on decision text

Parag.	Comments	Proposal
2.	The UK Supports ‘Welcomes’ as it seems the most appropriate language. The UK support the overall text as it	[Adopts] [Takes note of] [Welcomes] the long-term strategic approach to biodiversity mainstreaming contained in the annex to the present decision as an important contribution to the development of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework;

Parag.	Comments	Proposal
	<p>highlights the vital link between the work of the IAG and the framework.</p>	
<p>3.</p>	<p>The UK notes that ‘voluntary’ could lessen the impact the LTAM has as an effective guidance tool for parties to use to implement the mainstreaming elements from the GBF. However, we accept that this document is under the CBD so it would be up to Parties to take the necessary actions to implement mainstreaming as part of their own internal processes and National Action Plans</p> <p>Have added minor additional text.</p>	<p><i>Invites Parties and other Governments, at all levels, as well as businesses, civil society, indigenous peoples and local communities, and relevant stakeholders to use the long-term strategic approach to mainstreaming biodiversity as a further voluntary guidance tool in implementing the elements of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework related to biodiversity mainstreaming, as appropriate;</i></p>
<p>4.</p>	<p>The UK supports ‘Take note with appreciation’ as we see the action plan as the tangible actions that parties can choose to adopt but can accept ‘Take note’.</p> <p>The UK does take some issue with the term ‘voluntary’ – as the LTAM is now considered ‘voluntary’ the closely associated action plan should not be considered another ‘voluntary’ document, but should be called ‘complementary’ - as it provides the tangible actions one may require to mainstream biodiversity within their governing entities, businesses, local communities etc.</p> <p>We also suggest stronger language (utilise) to better encourage stakeholders, Parties and Governments etc to use these documents.</p>	<p><i>[Welcomes] [Takes note] [Takes note with appreciation] of the voluntary complementary action plan for the long-term strategic approach to mainstreaming biodiversity,¹ and encourages Parties and other Governments, at all levels, as well as businesses, research and development agencies, civil society, indigenous peoples and local communities, women and youth and relevant stakeholders to take into account utilise the catalogue of possible mainstreaming actions, in order to support the global biodiversity framework and its implementation, to be taken at all levels and across Governments, economic sectors and society and through the inclusion of those actions in their revised national biodiversity strategies and action plans, as appropriate;</i></p>
<p>5.</p>	<p>The UK overall supports this text however would like to add ‘commitments’ after ‘lesson learned’ as we believe that all parties and other governments should also be looking to report on previous and new relevant biodiversity and nature mainstreaming commitments.</p>	<p><i>Requests Parties and invites other Governments at all levels to report their case studies, good practices, lessons learned, commitments, and other relevant experiences in implementing the long term strategic approach and its action plan, as part of their national reports and in the clearing-house mechanism, and requests the Executive Secretary to consider this information in upcoming editions of the Global Biodiversity Outlook, including, as appropriate, experiences of indigenous peoples and local</i></p>

Parag.	Comments	Proposal
		<i>communities, business and civil society organizations, as well as other stakeholders;</i>
6.	<p>The UK again thanks the work of the Informal Advisory Group and fully support the establishment of the Ad Hoc Technical Expert Group with its extended mandate as it's replacement.</p> <p>However, we would request that AHTEG will review not only the LTAM but also the action plan as it is complementary to the LTAM and would like any new actions identified in its exchanging and analysis of case studies, good practices and lessons learnt if appropriate propose to be added to the action plan ahead of SBI-4.</p> <p>As with the row above, would like the addition of 'commitments' here to remain consistent.</p> <p>We strongly support the paragraph but on 6a (iv), while it seems reasonable to carry out a cost-benefit assessment, this could be time consuming and have cost implications and may end up blocking/delaying mainstreaming activities and efforts. We would request this remains in brackets until further negotiations between parties.</p> <p>Please also see UK suggestions under paragraph 16 below.</p>	<p><i>Recognizes the work of the Informal Advisory Group and its extended network and, building on their experience, advice and expertise, decides to establish an Ad Hoc Technical Expert Group on the Mainstreaming of Biodiversity to advise the Parties, the Bureau and the Secretariat on the implementation and review of the long-term strategic approach to biodiversity mainstreaming and it's complementary action plan in support of the global biodiversity framework, and to report on its work to the Subsidiary Body on Implementation at its fourth meeting, including on:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) <i>Exchanging and analysing case studies, good practices, and lessons learned, and commitments received by Governments, at all levels, businesses, research and development agencies, civil society, indigenous peoples and local communities, women and youth and other relevant stakeholders on;</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. <i>Identifying priority solutions to blockers and mainstreaming actions in sectors with the most significant dependencies and impacts on biodiversity;</i> ii. <i>Ways and means to strengthen the participation, representation, and capacity of civil society in implementing mainstreaming actions;</i> iii. <i>Biodiversity metrics which can be used by businesses and other actors to support the setting of science-based targets;</i> iv. <i>[The needs, costs, benefits and approaches to implementing mainstreaming actions of developing countries, taking into account their specific financial, technical, technological and capacity gaps;]</i> b) <i>Collaborating, as appropriate, with the ad hoc technical expert group on monitoring the post-2020 global biodiversity framework to be established in accordance with paragraph 11 of the draft decision on scientific and technical information to support the review of the updated goals and targets, and related indicators and baselines;2</i> c) <i>Deepening joint collaborative efforts and synergies with the Rio conventions and the biodiversity-related conventions (multilateral environmental agreements),</i>

Parag.	Comments	Proposal
		<i>among other relevant conventions, and such treaties as the chemical conventions;3</i>
7.	The UK believes that it is important to ensure this pre-COP17 review considers emerging scientific evidence so that the overall approach remains science based. Therefore, suggestion of ‘and the best available science and evidence’ has been added to the text.	<i>Requests the Subsidiary Body on Implementation, subject to the arrangements in place for reporting, monitoring and review of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework, to undertake a mid-term review of the long-term strategic approach and the action plan in support of the global biodiversity framework, at one of its meetings prior to the seventeenth meeting of the Conference of the Parties,⁴ reviewing the progress made, challenges encountered, and lessons learned, and the best available science and evidence, taking into account the specific taking into account the specific financial, technological and capacity gaps faced by developing countries in supporting mainstreaming policies, and identifying any need for further action on mainstreaming, for consideration by the Conference of the Parties at its seventeenth meeting;</i>
8.	Bracketed until further information and clarification. The UK would like the secretariat to provide further clarity on what this financial support would entail and provide this to parties ahead of COP15 for agreement. We strongly support the beginning of the text that ‘invites’ parties. And finally, we believe that any Party according to their capability are invited to provide financial support to the work of AHTEG.	<i>[Invites developed countries, Parties, and other Governments according to their capabilities, donors, as well as relevant organizations and initiatives, the private sector and multilateral development agencies, to provide financial support for the work of the Ad Hoc Technical Expert Group;]</i>
11.	The UK prefers ‘Takes note of’ but to be more flexible can also accept ‘Welcomes’.	<i>[Welcomes][Takes note of] the work carried out on mainstreaming under the Cartagena Protocol and the support provided in this regard by the Japan Biodiversity Fund, encourages Parties to the Cartagena Protocol and other stakeholders to step up their mainstreaming efforts, building on the long-term strategic approach, and invites donors to support such activities;</i>
12.	The UK requests that this paragraph is deleted as GEF already has a strong focus on biodiversity mainstreaming and so questions the value added if this text is unbrackets. If there is strong sentiment to maintain this text then the UK believes that the start of the para should start with ‘Invites’ rather than	<i>Requests the Global Environment Facility to strengthen mainstreaming in its future programming, and assist Parties in developing and implementing their mainstreaming actions aligned with revised national biodiversity strategies and action plans, building on the long-term strategic approach to mainstreaming biodiversity in accordance with national priorities and circumstances⁽⁵⁾;</i>

Parag.	Comments	Proposal
	<p>'Requests' as it will be up for the GEF council to decides on programme strategy and priorities.</p>	
14.	<p>The UK supports this paragraph, but has made minor textual changes that states these set of measurements for business should be user friendly and easy to understand.</p>	<p><i>Invites the United Nations Environment Programme World Conservation Monitoring Centre and collaborating institutions to continue the work with a view to agreeing on a comparable set of measurements for businesses related to the three pillars of the Convention which are easily communicable and can be integrated into corporate disclosure and reporting, in line with the set of headline indicators for the global biodiversity framework;</i></p>
16.	<p>The UK supports this paragraph however requests that with respect to sub paragraph:</p> <p>a) Is consistent with UK suggestions in paragraph 6 (a) in particular 'governments at all levels'. Additionally ensure that text in bold is reflected within paragraph 6 when discussing potential new programmes of work.</p> <p>b) 'ensuring supply chains are accounted for according to international standards and codes of conduct 'isn't clear what is meant by this. Therefore, we suggest it is removed.</p>	<p><i>Requests the Executive Secretary, subject to the availability of resources:</i></p> <p>a) <i>To support the work of the Ad Hoc Technical Expert Group as per paragraph 6 above and, in particular, to develop an overview of the status of implementation of the existing programmes of work as well as potential new programmes of work with potential partners, in consideration of the proposed action plan for the long-term approach to mainstreaming biodiversity⁴ and the updated zero draft of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework;⁶</i></p> <p>b) <i>To continue to cooperate and coordinate with the extended open consultive network of relevant organizations and initiatives working on various elements of the biodiversity mainstreaming agenda, relevant multilateral environmental agreements, including biodiversity-related conventions, the Rio conventions, the hazardous chemicals and wastes conventions, relevant international sectoral organizations and their programmes, other relevant processes, such as the implementation of the programmes of work under the Convention on Biological Diversity, and to continue organizing, in collaboration with relevant global, regional, and thematic organizations and other stakeholders, and in conjunction with capacity building activities, the monitoring and review mechanism of the global biodiversity framework, and resource mobilization tasks and commitments, relevant workshops and forums for discussion and exchange of experiences with respect to mainstreaming of biodiversity in key sectors, further to decision 14/3, paragraph 19(g);</i></p> <p>c) <i>To collaborate with the secretariats of other Rio and biodiversity-related conventions, the Biodiversity Liaison Group, the United Nations Environment Management Group, youth, women, indigenous peoples and local communities and other relevant</i></p>

Parag.	Comments	Proposal
		<p><i>organizations and stakeholders to optimize synergies among similar initiatives related to mainstreaming and multi-stakeholder cooperation, to propose viable participatory methods, both those based on science, free of conflict of interest and under the precautionary approach, and those that include traditional knowledge, especially those related to the value that biological diversity has for indigenous peoples and local communities, with their consent, and to promote collaboration and conflict resolution among relevant stakeholders with a view to improving environmental governance around biodiversity conservation projects;</i></p> <p>d) <i>To continue to promote and collaborate in the work on business metrics for biodiversity on the basis of existing as well as emerging tools and approaches, and on the definition of strategies for productive sectors in their business decisions in order to integrate biodiversity into their corporate accounting and decision-making frameworks. ensuring their supply chains are accounted for according to international standards and codes of conduct;</i></p> <p>e) <i>To continue to promote, expand and provide support to the Global Partnership for Business and Biodiversity and its national and regional partnerships, with a view to scaling up these partnerships, to further enhance their effectiveness as a mechanism for engaging businesses and exchanging pertinent experiences and best practices, including through the Global Forum on Business and Biodiversity as a multi-stakeholder platform for exchanges at all levels of governance and with relevant players, and to identify gaps, opportunities, challenges and lessons learned in mainstreaming;</i></p> <p>f) <i>To strengthen the Sharm El-Sheikh to Kunming Action Agenda in order to encourage and catalyse commitments to concretely support the global biodiversity framework, the long-term strategic approach to mainstreaming, and sectoral and societal implementation of biodiversity mainstreaming policies, notably by creating coalitions and communities of practices;</i></p> <p>g) <i>To submit a progress report on these activities, as well as on any other pertinent developments, and include proposals for undertaking the mid-term review of the long-term strategic approach, consistent with the arrangements in place for reporting, monitoring and review of the post2020 global biodiversity framework, for consideration by the</i></p>

Parag.	Comments	Proposal
		<i>Subsidiary Body on Implementation at its fourth meeting.</i>

B. Comments on the annex

Annex Para.	Comments	Proposals
2.	The UK supports this paragraph but as it is stated here that the LTAM is based on scientific evidence please see textual suggestions for Para 3 below.	
3.	To remain consistent that UK suggest to add reference to the action plan in addition to the suggestion to add text to reflect that scientific evidence should be borne in mind when under review.	The long-term strategic approach and its complementary action plan should be kept under review by the Conference of the Parties and be flexible enough to respond to advances in the best available scientific evidence, mindful of national circumstance and priorities, ensuring full consistency with other relevant international agreements and refraining from prejudging the outcomes of ongoing negotiations in other multilateral fora.
6.	Being consistent with earlier UK comments, we request the replacement of voluntary with complementary.	In order to facilitate the design and implementation of nationally determined priority mainstreaming actions, the voluntary complementary action plan to the long-term strategic approach ⁷ will also reference useful mainstreaming guidance, tools, and good practice cases. The following strategy and action areas are particularly important as areas where a long-term strategic approach is required, but not limited to the areas indicated.

B. General comments on the overall LTAM and action plan

Bolivia (Plurinational State of)

Suggestion to change title - “Long-term approach to biodiversity mainstreaming *as Nationally Voluntary Guidance*”

It is important to incorporate a section in principles, which should highlight at least the following aspects:

- a. The work on mainstreaming biodiversity recognizes that there are diverse approaches, visions, models and tools available to each country, in accordance with their national circumstances and priorities, to achieve sustainable development in the context of achieving the main goals of the Convention and its protocols.
- b. The work on mainstreaming biodiversity must not promote the commodification of ecosystem functions and services of nature and it should be oriented towards enhancing the harmonic relationship between peoples and nature, while respecting human rights and the rights of Mother Earth.
- c. The work on mainstreaming biodiversity recognizes different knowledge systems, and in particular the need to protect and strengthen indigenous peoples' systems of knowledge, recognition that Mother Earth is a living being and sacred, and the protection of the indigenous peoples and local communities' rights.

Brazil

Brazil understands that the streamlined version of the Long-Term Approach to Biodiversity Mainstreaming, as presented in the Annex to SBI Recommendation 15 (CBD/SBI/REC/3/15), provides a good basis for further discussions. As many countries have expressed concerns regarding the demanding schedule that will be required to complete the negotiations of draft decisions during COP-15, Brazil recommends caution concerning proposals to reintroduce the headline actions that have been originally proposed under document CBD/SBI/3/13. Brazil believes that an effective long-term approach to mainstreaming should provide a flexible framework that Parties to the Convention and its Protocols should adapt to their national circumstances, as countries face different national contexts, socioeconomic conditions and challenges. Therefore, Brazil is of the view that the long-term approach must not be an overly prescriptive document that only a few Parties to the Convention might be in a position to implement. In addition, it should fully consider the capacity, technical, institutional, technological and financial gaps and constraints that affect developing country Parties and undermine their capacity to implement mainstreaming policies in the long run. It should further recognize that there is no "one-size-fits-all approach" to implement mainstreaming policies and that efforts by national governments and all relevant stakeholders must be fully consistent with relevant international obligations, in particular trade-related obligations, with a view to preventing the Convention from encroaching on the mandates of relevant multilateral agreements and organizations.

Regarding more specifically the Action Plan for the Long-Term Approach, Brazil would like to reiterate its position that such a document has not been mandated by COP Decision 14/3. Given the complexity of the many proposed activities, Brazil believes that this document will require in-depth and lengthy intergovernmental negotiations, which risk diverting efforts from the core items of the COP agenda, which should focus on finalizing the GBF. Many of the proposed activities under document CBD/SBI/3/13/Add.1 are of critical importance to support the mainstreaming agenda in the long term, and Brazil remains deeply concerned that if the CBD community engages in hasty discussions, we will miss the opportunity to build a solid, inclusive and transparent Action Plan that truly resonates with different national circumstances, challenges and priorities. Brazil would also like to express concern regarding the fact that many of the proposed activities and actions preempt ongoing discussions on the goals and targets of the Post-2020 GBF. Therefore, Brazil requests document CBD/SBI/3/13/Add.1 to be deferred for further consideration to COP16, as this would allow thorough consultations amongst Parties at a later stage.

Canada

Canada is of the view that the Long-Term Strategic Approach should not be duplicative of existing initiatives, including the goals and target of the Post-2020 Global Biodiversity. As such, we hope to see efforts to align the Approach with the Post-2020 Global Biodiversity Framework while avoiding overlaps.

We saw the Approach as a way to operationalize the elements of the GBF that relates to mainstreaming in a tangible and practical way; however, we do not feel that the Approach has accomplished this objective

quite yet. The approach currently repeats the language of some of the targets of the GBF rather than provide additional guidance. In view of this, we think that more work is needed to strength the document and provide value added.

Chile

Primero que nada, se solicita realizar una evaluación respecto a los plazos en todo el documento, ya que hay varios hitos propuestos en el documento Plan de acción a cumplirse el 2022, que no serán viables.

Courtesy translation: First of all, an evaluation is requested regarding the deadlines throughout the document, since there are several milestones proposed in the Action Plan document to be met by 2022, which will not be feasible.

En el documento del Enfoque a Largo Plazo (CBD/SBI/3/13) se aborda el concepto de “agua limpia. Al respecto, se indica como ambiguo el concepto y sugiere abordar precisando qué se entiende por ello y a qué estándares de calidad apunta, por ej. “que contribuyen al suministro de agua con la calidad que deben tener acuíferos que sustentan biodiversidad”.

Referido al concepto de Paisaje (Área de acción 1, Acción 1.3): Pese a que en Chile ya se está abordando más fuertemente este concepto a través del Plan Nacional de Restauración de Paisajes, y está plasmado en la Ley 19.300, se estima que el concepto ya debe haber sido ampliamente abordado en otras instancias del CBD, por lo que se sugiere que se incluya una nota al pie, que de una referencia o redirija a otros documentos para mejorar su comprensión por todos los países y niveles de trabajo.

En la misma Acción 1.3, también se señala “aumentar los impactos positivos a nivel de paisajes terrestres, paisajes marinos y urbano”, pero no se abordan los paisajes acuáticos, se sugiere incluir.

Courtesy translation: The Long-Term Approach document (CBD/SBI/3/13) addresses the concept of “clean water. In this regard, the concept is indicated as ambiguous and suggests addressing it by specifying what is meant by it and what quality standards it points to, for example, “that contribute to the supply of water with the quality that aquifers that sustain biodiversity should have”.

Referring to the concept of Landscape* (Action Area 1, Action 1.3 and elsewhere): Although this concept is already being addressed more strongly in Chile through the National Plan for Landscape Restoration, and is reflected in Law 19,300, it is estimated that the concept must already have been widely addressed in other instances of the CBD, so it is suggested that a footnote be included, that provides a reference or redirects to other documents to improve its understanding by all countries and levels of work. In the same Action 1.3, it is also pointed out to “increase positive impacts at the level of terrestrial landscapes, seascapes and urban landscapes”, but aquatic landscapes are not addressed, it is suggested to include them.

**Translator’s note: Paisaje, in Spanish, also refers to coastal, aquatic and marine seascapes, i.e. to all areas affected by spatial planning.*

Respecto al documento Enfoque a Largo Plazo:

Se considera muy acertado que la implementación de este marco de integración tenga un enfoque en la reducción de las amenazas o presiones hacia la biodiversidad, así como en identificar herramientas y soluciones para aumentar el impacto de las medidas sobre la biodiversidad.

Courtesy translation: Regarding the Long-Term Approach document in general:

It is considered very positive that the implementation of this integration framework has a focus on reducing threats or pressures on biodiversity, as well as on identifying tools and solutions to increase the impact of measures on biodiversity.

Respecto al documento Plan de Acción:

Se está en acuerdo que el enfoque del marco a largo plazo y las acciones señaladas en el plan de acción son propuestas de acción coherentes y necesarias, aunque ambiciosas, que conlleva una toma de decisiones, de compromisos y la generación de coordinaciones en todos los niveles.

Son metas que imponen importantes desafíos para nuestro país, desde la articulación hasta la implementación, que requerirán involucramiento y gran participación multisectorial, además de voluntad política y recursos humanos disponibles.

Se apoya la decisión de lograr la participación activa de los diversos entes económicos, organizaciones de financiación y otros para aunar esfuerzos. También se está en acuerdo que su ejecución dependerá de las capacidades de cada país.

El plan de acción responde a las decisiones que se han adoptado desde la COP 13; requiere el compromiso y activa participación de diferentes actores, teniendo un rol fundamental los aspectos económico-financiero

El documento se percibe como ambicioso, pero alcanzable si se logra mediar el conjunto de los actores involucrados; se advierte como un plan de acción participativo e inclusivo, que coincide con la importancia que reviste la promoción de nuevos patrones de consumo y producción como requisito necesario para preservar los recursos naturales, en línea con el desarrollo sostenible.

Algunos plazos de acciones intermedias serían difíciles de cumplir, toda vez que involucran diferentes actores, los cuales no han sido consultados, como el sector privado económico y financiero

Se considera imprescindible contar con la opinión, observaciones y posición del sector privado; económico y financiero

Se percibe como una propuesta poco precisa en términos del nivel de actores que deberían ser convocados o involucrados en los procesos para la integración de consideración de biodiversidad en el sector económico y financiero. Se sugiere generar orientaciones a los países e informar estudios de caso exitosos para el involucramiento de estos sectores, incluyendo mecanismos y/o arreglos posibles, así como indicadores de medición del éxito de estas metas

La implementación de este plan de acción requerirá un importante compromiso tanto en recursos humanos como financieros

Los principales ajustes que requiere este plan de acción tienen relación con ajustes administrativos, para reportar y dar a conocer de mejor forma los avances en las diversas áreas de trabajo institucional en relación con la protección de la biodiversidad.

Respecto de las metas vinculadas a transparentar el impacto de las actividades económicas sobre la biodiversidad, existirá un desafío institucional para dar cuenta de impactos de actividades productivas, como por ej. de fomento forestal.

Courtesy translation: Regarding the Action Plan document in general:

It is agreed that the focus of the long-term framework and the actions indicated in the action plan are coherent and necessary action proposals, although ambitious, which entails decision-making, commitments and the generation of coordination at all levels.

These are goals that impose important challenges for our country, from the articulation to the implementation, which will require involvement and great multisectoral participation, as well as political will and available human resources.

The decision to achieve the active participation of the various economic entities, financing organizations and others to join efforts is supported. It is also agreed that its execution will depend on the capacities of each country.

The action plan responds to the decisions that have been adopted since COP 13; requires the commitment and active participation of different actors, with the economic-financial aspects having a fundamental role.

The document is perceived as ambitious, but achievable if mediation is achieved by all the actors involved; It is seen as a participatory and inclusive action plan, which coincides with the importance of promoting new patterns of consumption and production as a necessary requirement to preserve natural resources, in line with sustainable development.

Some deadlines for intermediate actions would be difficult to meet, since they involve different actors, which have not been consulted, such as the private economic and financial sector

It is considered essential to have the opinion, observations and position of the private sector; economic and financial

The Action Plan is still an imprecise proposal in terms of the level of actors that should be summoned or involved in the processes for the integration of biodiversity consideration in the economic and financial sector. It is suggested to generate guidelines for the countries and report successful case studies for the involvement of these sectors, including possible mechanisms and/or arrangements, as well as indicators to measure the success of these goals.

The implementation of this action plan will require a significant commitment in both human and financial resources.

The main adjustments required by this action plan are related to governance/administrative adjustments, to better report and publicize the progress in the various areas of institutional work in relation to the protection of biodiversity.

Regarding the goals linked to making transparent the impact of economic activities on biodiversity, there will be an institutional challenge to account for the impacts of productive activities, such as forest development.

European Union and its member States

We underline the importance of the LTAM with its actions, as presented in CBD/SBI/3/13. We do not recall having had any agreement on deleting them. Therefore, we would like to request reinserting the actions in the LTAM. All changes and text proposals made on the strategy areas, headline actions and actions for the LTAM apply to the Action Plan and shall be made - respectively - for the Action Plan on the Strategy areas,

action areas and actions. Please re-insert all the actions as presented in CBD/SBI/3/13, namely under Headline Action 1 to 5, and **all the comments and text proposals made** under all strategy areas for the LTAM also here for the Action Plan.

The Action Plan requires an update regarding all mentioned dates and timelines as well as an in-depth alignment with the outcomes (wording and contents) of the negotiations of the OEWG, SBI and SBSTTA.

Switzerland

Switzerland thanks the Executive Secretary for the preparation of the full set of documents introducing and supporting a long-term strategic approach to mainstreaming biodiversity (LTAM). Switzerland supports the development and adoption of a LTAM as a key activity to achieve the three goals of the Convention and as a support to a successful implementation of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework (GBF). However, Switzerland has the following concerns and comments on the LTAM, as proposed in document SBI/3/13, and its action plan, as depicted in document SBI/3/13/Add.1.

A. Main concerns by Switzerland

1. Explicitly address and describe the role of multilateral environmental agreements, organizations and processes for mainstreaming biodiversity to ensure coherent implementation and ensure the use of synergies.

Rational: The general structure of the LTAM includes the strategic areas on mainstreaming biodiversity in i) governments and its policies, ii) business models of key economic sectors and, iii) across society. Further, the LTAM proposes a multitude of activities targeted at international organizations and processes but misses to depict a strategic approach to foster global cooperation in a view to establish and foster coalitions in support of the LTAM so as to ensure the effective use of synergies and urgently needed collaboration in support of the approach. In this context, a reference to the Data Reporting Tool for MEAs (DaRT) is missing as it adds value in supporting Parties to effectively use synergies in the field of national reporting to biodiversity-related conventions.

2. The LTAM is strongly focused on financial institutions and does not adequately consider other businesses

Rational: The LTAM includes action area 4 to financial institutions, proposing detailed activities to be implemented, which is in line with CBD COP decision 14/3, paragraph 6(i). Other businesses, however, are addressed in action area 3 in a universal way. This creates an imbalance in the LTAM. Other businesses, such as energy and mining, infrastructure and manufacturing and processing sectors (see CBD COP decision 14/3, paragraph 13) are indeed addressed across the board only.

3. The LTAM cannot be completed since the GBF action targets have not been finally negotiated

Rational: As the GBF action targets are currently being negotiated by Parties and are scheduled to be adopted during CBD COP-15, the LTAM needs to be updated in the light of the outcomes of the 4th meeting of the OEWG.

4. Position regarding to financial/fiscal actions (action area 2 and 4)

Rational: The LATAM is right; addressing incentives harmful to biodiversity is part of the mainstreaming agenda. The nature and scope of the multiple possible activities (and linked milestones) vary widely creating another imbalance. Many are welcomed and necessary, however, their implementation and the involved actors will vary and be country specific.

B. Conclusions and suggested changes

In conclusion, Switzerland recommends

- Further development of the LTAM by the Executive Secretary in preparation of COP-15, based on the inputs by the countries following notification SCBD/SSSF/JL/ML/OH/GD/90250 as well as the outcomes of the 4th meeting of the OEWG.
- That the Executive Secretary submits an updated draft of the LTAM for consideration by CBD COP-15.
- Switzerland proposes that the updated draft LTAM includes the following elements:
 - i. Include a vision for a strategic approach to international collaboration among MEAs and other relevant organizations on mainstreaming of biodiversity as a cross-cutting strategic area to ensure efficient collaboration among actors and the effective use of synergies in implementing the LTAM. In this context, the Data Reporting Tool for MEAs (DaRT) should be referenced, as it adds value in supporting Parties to effectively use synergies in the field of national reporting to biodiversity-related conventions.
 - ii. Include other sectors alike agriculture, forestry, fisheries and aquaculture, as well as energy and mining, infrastructure and manufacturing and processing sectors in addition to financial institutions.
 - iii. Review the LTAM in the light of the progress made in negotiation the post-2020GBF, especially, taking into account the outcomes of the 4th meeting of the OEWG, scheduled to take place on 21-26 June 2022 in Nairobi (Kenya), with the objective to ensure coherence and avoid duplication of relevant topics and issues.
 - iv. Ensure consistency with (the language of) the post-2020 GBF and take into account the great variety in the way in which the proposed actions can be implemented and progress measured. Accordingly (the definition of) the possible milestones should be more open.
- Switzerland welcomes the LTAM as a resource document on long-term approaches and possible actions that can be implemented on a voluntary basis by Parties.

United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland

The Independent Dasgupta Review on the Economics of Biodiversity, commissioned by the UK government and published in February 2021, is clear that our economies are embedded within nature – and outstripping it. If we are to achieve the objectives of the CBD in an integrated way, as called for in the Leaders’ Pledge for Nature, we must mainstream biodiversity across all economic sectors, government, and society.

Mainstreaming must be weaved throughout the post-2020 framework, where it can act as a tool and an approach to implementing and achieving the goals and targets. The updated LTAM is helpful in providing some detail on mainstreaming Strategic Areas, but further development is still needed on how it will directly support the implementation and delivery of the biodiversity integration across the post-2020 framework. More importantly, the proposed AHTEG must be supported by parties in review and updating of both the LTAM and the Action Plan especially leading up to COP16.

Establishing timeline/deadline for action(s) which are considered voluntary under the LTAM does not make sense. With dates, determining the success of an action sounds more like an objective/end goal. Additionally, timelines should be established by the actor found within the actor column. Therefore, **we strongly prefer the removal** of all dates from text within the action plan. If it is absolutely necessary, then place a note at the start of the document that states ‘actions found below have been developed to help bend the curve of biodiversity loss as stated under the Post 2020 Global Biodiversity Framework’.

‘[Possible] Measures of success’ might be better than ‘Possible Milestones’ as a stakeholder will want to see what a successful outcome of an action would be before carrying it out.

One additional action to be considered for the action plan is Target 14 Bis. However, the UK will discuss this further under contacts group discussions.

C. Specific comments on each strategy area and headline action of the long-term strategic approach to mainstreaming

STRATEGY AREA I: Mainstreaming biodiversity across government and its policies

HEADLINE ACTION 1: Fully integrate ecosystem and biodiversity values into national and local planning, development processes, poverty reduction strategies and accounts, integrating spatial planning and applying the principles of the ecosystem approach

Belarus

Headline Action 1: Fully integrate ecosystem and biodiversity values³ into national and local planning, development processes, poverty reduction strategies and accounts,⁴ integrating spatial planning and applying the principles of the ecosystem approach.⁵

Belarus: Ministries for environmental protection, with scientific support, to apply best practices on environmental impact assessments and biodiversity mainstreaming to decisions, including those of public and private financial institutions, related to the approval of projects and investments in these sectors.

Belarus: Ministries for environmental protection to include approaches to conserve, enhance and sustainably use biodiversity and ecosystem functions and services in upstream decisions on investments in these sectors, through such available tools as strategic environmental assessments and integrated spatial planning, including the evaluation of alternatives to such investments

Bolivia (Plurinational State of)

Headline Action 1: Fully integrate ecosystem and biodiversity multiple values into ~~national and local planning~~, sustainable development processes and, poverty reduction strategies according to national priorities and circumstances ~~and accounts, integrating spatial planning and applying the principles of the ecosystem approach.~~

The rationale should be changed as follows: Mainstreaming across governments and its policies will ensure that biological diversity is included in all relevant policies, according to the national priorities and circumstance, in order to enhance sustainable development and poverty eradication. Positive actions and good practices of countries must be identified and assessed to scale-up those best actions and practices across all sectors within a holistic approach. Also, good lessons identified at regional and global level by IPBES deliverables must orient the development of policies, strategies, and programs at the national level.

Brazil

Brazil believes that Headline Action 1 provides an adequate scope to foster the mainstreaming of	Brazil suggests the following amendments to Headline Action 1:
--	--

³ See decision X/3, para. 9(b)(ii): the intrinsic, ecological, genetic, social economic, scientific, educational, cultural, recreational and aesthetic values of biological diversity and its components.

⁴ Sustainable Development Goal 15.9, with an updated timeline (2030 instead of 2020).

⁵ See decision V/6. See also <https://www.cbd.int/ecosystem/>.

<p>biodiversity values across government actions. At the same time, some elements require further clarification. It remains unclear for instance what kind of approaches are being suggested in the sentence “promoting an integrated approach to health, research and innovation, scientific and technological cooperation, development cooperation, climate change and desertification”.</p> <p>In addition, Brazil is of the view that enhanced international cooperation will be needed to enable developing countries to assess, map and monitor, on a regular basis, biodiversity values provided by their ecosystems and the corresponding ecosystem services.</p> <p>On a conceptual note, Brazil would suggest replacing the expression “water security” with “water affordability and accessibility”, as the expression “water security” lacks a multilaterally-agreed upon definition and the expressions “affordability and accessibility” are consistent with UNGA Resolution A/RES/64/292, on the human right to water and sanitation.</p>	<p>Mainstreaming across governments and its policies will ensure that biological diversity is considered in all relevant policy areas of governments at all levels, in particular with regard to policies related to finance, economics, planning, development, poverty alleviation, reducing inequality, promoting food security providing accessible and affordable water to all and food and water security, promoting an integrated approach to synergies across national policies aimed at addressing health, research and innovation, scientific and technological cooperation, development cooperation, climate change and desertification, as well as policies related to key economic sectors, in particular those that relate to the IPBES approach for sustainability, possible actions and pathways,¹ and nexus areas.²</p> <p>Due attention should be given to the capacity, institutional and technological gaps and constraints developing country Parties face to monitor, map and assess, on a regular basis, the biodiversity values from their ecosystems and their corresponding ecosystem services. Enhanced international cooperation, including by fostering North-South, South-South and triangular partnerships and strengthening data sharing, will be needed to enable developing countries to monitor biodiversity trends and develop national conservation, restoration and sustainable management and use policies tailored to their national circumstances.</p>
--	--

Canada

If the LTAM is meant to be further guidance in implementing the elements of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework related to biodiversity mainstreaming, Canada believes that this section be further developed. It could help to unpack the elements under target 14.

At the moment it is simply repeating some of the elements under target 14. **In sum, we are unsure of the value added of this headline action as currently drafted.**

European Union and its member States

<p>Headline action 1 and actions 1.1, 1.2, 1.3</p>	<p>Proposal to keep the actions (as presented in CBD/SBI/3/13), as well as amendments and add an additional action (action 1.4) under headline action 1 on harmful incentives to</p>	<p>Mainstreaming biodiversity within and across all levels of government and its policies.</p> <p>Headline Action 1: Fully integrate ecosystem and values of biodiversity and ecosystem services <u>biodiversity values</u>¹ into national and local planning, development processes, poverty reduction strategies and accounts,² integrating spatial</p>
---	--	---

	<p>enhance coherence with the GBF (e.g target 18). (<u>text bold and underlined or strikedthrough</u>).</p>	<p>planning and applying the principles of the ecosystem approach, <u>including through the National Biodiversity Finance Plans or other similar instruments as well as recovery plans from the COVID pandemic and, more generally, the prevention of future crises.</u>³</p> <p><u>Rationale:</u> Mainstreaming <u>biodiversity within and</u> across governments and its policies will ensure that biological diversity is considered in all relevant policy areas of governments at all levels, in particular with regard to policies related to finance, economics, <u>trade</u>, planning, development, poverty alleviation, reducing inequality and food and water security, promoting an integrated approach to health, research and innovation, scientific and technological cooperation, development cooperation, climate change and desertification, as well as policies related to key economic sectors, in particular those that relate to the IPBES approach for sustainability, possible actions and pathways,⁴ and nexus areas.⁵</p> <p><u>Action 1.1:</u> Governments at all levels systematically apply strengthened biodiversity assessment, valuation, and accounting tools <u>and</u> methodologies for biodiversity mainstreaming, and use results to inform decision-making, <u>including through Strategic Environmental Assessments for sectoral and regional planning.</u></p> <p><u>Action 1.2:</u> Governments enhance policy coherence by establishing effective <u>and efficient</u> structures and processes for interministerial and cross-sectoral collaboration and for coordination of programmes and policies related to biodiversity among national, subnational and local governments.</p> <p><u>Action 1.3:</u> Governments at all levels implement integrated spatial planning and management, <u>complementing the Strategic Environmental Assessment,</u> for avoiding and decreasing negative and increasing positive impacts on biodiversity at landscape, seascape and urban levels, including, as appropriate, through voluntary or regulatory plans, and innovative policies and programmes related to economic sectors affecting biodiversity loss, respecting the mitigation hierarchy and striving towards net positive impacts.</p> <p><i>(Insert this new action):</i> <u>Action 1.4: Governments eliminate regulatory measures or incentives that are harmful to biodiversity and scale-up</u></p>
--	--	--

		<u>biodiversity-positive sectoral and cross-sectoral regulatory measures.</u>
--	--	--

Haiti (Biodiversity valuation – see also under headline 2 below)

Comments	Proposals
There is still much work to do to better assess biodiversity values within the countries. Mainstreaming valuation will guide regulations related to environmental protection	Build capacity in biodiversity and ecosystems services valuation methods and techniques and support policy development to mainstream these tools as it relates to infrastructure, energy, mining, agriculture, tourism development.

Mexico

Comments	Proposals
It is suggested to exemplify the levels of government (Regional, national, subnational/local) since there are decisions that are made by state and not by country.	... its policies will ensure that biological diversity is considered in all relevant policy areas of governments at all levels (<i>Regional, national, subnational/local</i>), in particular with regard to policies related to finance, economics, planning, development...

Switzerland

Switzerland suggests deleting the reference to “ecosystem values” and replace it by “ecosystem functions and service”, as included in CBD COP decision 14/3, paragraph 13	Action area 1: Fully integrate ecosystem and the value of biodiversity and ecosystem functions and service values into national and local planning, development processes, poverty reduction strategies and accounts, integrating spatial planning and applying the principles of the ecosystem approach
The indicators of headline action 1 (doc SBI/3/13) do not (necessarily) match the actions proposed. Indeed, the adoption of national targets in NBSAPs is not requested, alike the implementation of the SEEA or the adoption of biodiversity targets within key policy documents.	Clarify the use and the match of indicators

Uganda

Comments	Proposals
Ecosystem and biodiversity values should not only integrated into national development frameworks (policies, plans and strategies) but also in the overall statements and calculations of the Gross Domestic Product (GDP), and other strategies like development and application of	Inclusion of ecosystem and biodiversity values in the national accounting system (NAS)- greening the NAS and GDP through the incorporation of system of environmental accounting through SEEA framework to demonstrate the costs of ecosystem/biodiversity loss,

strategic environment assessment (SEA), and environment and social impact assessment (ESIA) tools.	and the benefits of ecosystem/biodiversity conservation on the national economy-GDP
--	---

United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland

Headline action 1	<p>The UK would like to bracket this action until target 14 of the GBF is agreed to by parties.</p> <p>Overall, this headline action we can tentatively support in terms of planning, spatial planning and environmental assessments as Generally doing this already via national policy and approaches. See further comments on action plan for more details.</p>	<p>[Headline Action 1: Fully integrate ecosystem and biodiversity values⁸ into national and local planning, development processes, poverty reduction strategies and accounts,⁹ integrating spatial planning and applying the principles of the ecosystem approach.¹⁰]</p>
-------------------	--	---

HEADLINE ACTION 2: Mainstream biodiversity in fiscal, budgetary and financial instruments, in particular by eliminating, phasing out or reforming incentives, including subsidies harmful to biodiversity in key economic sectors, by applying innovative technologies, and by developing and applying positive incentives for the conservation, restoration and sustainable use of biodiversity, consistent and in harmony with the Convention and other relevant international obligations, taking into account national socioeconomic conditions.

Bolivia (Plurinational State of)

Mainstream biodiversity in fiscal, budgetary and financial instruments, in particular by eliminating, phasing out and/or reforming incentives, including subsidies harmful to biodiversity in key economic sectors, by applying relevant policies and actions ~~innovative technologies, and by developing and applying positive incentives for the conservation, restoration and sustainable use of biodiversity,~~ consistent and in harmony with the Convention and other relevant international obligations, taking into account national priorities and socioeconomic conditions.

The rationale should be changed as follows: The issue of subsidies is relevant with the long-term approach to biodiversity and therefore, relevant policies must be addressed to guarantee a just transition of countries to protect and sustainable use biodiversity in the context of eliminating, phasing out and/or reforming subsidies in key economic sectors.

Headline Action 2 bis: Mainstreaming biodiversity by recognizing, promoting and implementing Mother-Earth centred actions, including the rights of Mother Earth, in the context of cosmobiocentric visions and approaches of indigenous peoples and local communities, and their incorporation into relevant policies.

Rationale: Mainstreaming biodiversity across governments and its policies will ensure that relevant policies areas of governments at all levels, consider the recognition of cosmobiocentric approaches of indigenous peoples and local communities and rights-based approaches, and therefore Mother Earth centred actions, included the recognition of the rights of Mother Earth are considered in policies, programs and projects, as included in the IPBES conceptual framework.

Brazil

<p>Given the concerns many Parties to the Convention have expressed regarding the consistency between proposals to eliminate, phase out and/or reform harmful incentives and develop positive incentives and the existing obligations under the World Trade Organization, Brazil believes an explicit reference to WTO obligations and rules must be included within this Headline Action. While positive incentives have been gaining traction as an important tool to account for environmental externalities, those incentives must be carefully designed, in order not to generate market distortions that may lead to inefficiencies, harm producers in third countries, in particular developing countries, and consequently undermine local livelihoods, which may further aggravate social and economic challenges leading to environmental degradation.</p> <p>Furthermore, Brazil believes that the mainstreaming of biodiversity in fiscal, budgetary and financial instruments should aim at developing innovative financial mechanisms that could contribute to fostering sustainable activities and supporting sustainable livelihoods, such as payments for environmental schemes.</p>	<p>Brazil suggests the following amendments to Headline Action 2:</p> <p>Headline Action 2. Mainstream biodiversity in fiscal, budgetary and financial instruments, in particular by eliminating, phasing out and/or reforming incentives, including subsidies harmful to biodiversity in key economic sectors, by applying innovative technologies, and by developing and applying positive incentives for the conservation, restoration and sustainable use of biodiversity, consistent and in harmony with the Convention and other relevant international obligations, in particular obligations under the World Trade Organization, taking into account national priorities and socioeconomic conditions and avoiding trade-distortive policy measures.</p> <p>Rationale: Ending or reforming incentives, including subsidies, that are harmful to biodiversity is a critical component of incentive alignment. There will be a need for financial provision to developing countries to fund the national implementation of positive incentives in the global South, including innovative financial mechanisms that foster the adequate valuation of conservation, restoration, sustainable management and use activities and engage the private sector, IPLCs and other relevant stakeholders, such as payments for environmental services.</p>
---	--

Canada

<p>We suggest deleting the language that indicate that there will be a need for financial provision to developing countries. We do not believe that this wording constitute a rationale. It could be reflected elsewhere, perhaps in the decision text.</p>	<p>Ending or reforming incentives, including subsidies, that are harmful to biodiversity is a critical component of incentive alignment. There will be a need for financial provision to developing countries to fund the national implementation of positive incentives in the global South.</p>
<p>Comments We think that this section could be used to advance the work of Parties on the implementation of target 18. As such we would like to bracket the sections that reference the wording of target 18 to ensure that it is consistent with the text that will be approved in the GBF.</p>	<p><u>Proposals</u> <u>Develop guidance tools and good practices to support the mainstreaming</u> biodiversity in fiscal, budgetary and financial instruments, in particular by <u>in order to support the</u> [eliminating, phasing out and/or reforming incentives, including subsidies harmful to biodiversity in key economic sectors,] by applying innovative technologies, and by [developing and applying positive incentives for the conservation, restoration and sustainable use of biodiversity, consistent and in harmony with the Convention and other relevant international obligations, taking into</p>

	account national priorities and socioeconomic conditions.]
--	--

Colombia

Headline Action	Comments	Proposals
Headline action 2	It is necessary to promote the development and use of technologies that help conserve and use biological diversity in a sustainable way.	Number of countries with national instruments with tax benefits for the development and use of technologies that help conserve and sustainably use biological diversity
Headline action 2	<p>Dar prioridad a las industrias más dañinas a fin de actuar sobre los sectores de mayor impacto (ganadería intensiva, agricultura, las principales industrias extractivas, artículos de lujo y comercio de vida silvestre).</p> <p>Especial mención merece la industria de plásticos (que proviene casi 100% del petróleo) y los procesos de “compensación de plásticos” y “plástico neutral”. Es imperativo que este sector se priorice para reporte en los sistemas de contabilidad y transparencia para evitar lavado verde.</p> <p><i>Courtesy translation:</i> Prioritize the most damaging industries in order to act on the sectors with the greatest impact (intensive livestock, agriculture, the main extractive industries, luxury goods and the wildlife trade).</p> <p>The plastics industry (which comes almost 100% from oil) and the “plastic compensation” and “neutral plastic” processes deserves special mention. It is imperative that this sector be prioritized for reporting in accounting and transparency systems to avoid greenwashing.</p>	<p>Incluir una mención de la industria de plásticos</p> <p><i>Courtesy translation:</i> Include a mention of the plastics industry</p>

European Union and its member States

Headline action 2 and action 2.1, 2.2, 2.3	We propose to keep the actions (as presented in CBD/SBI/3/13), as well as amendments and to have a more thorough rationale for Headline action 2.	Headline action 2: Mainstream biodiversity in fiscal, budgetary and financial instruments, in particular by eliminating, phasing out, reforming and/or reforming-redirecting incentives, including subsidies harmful to biodiversity in key economic sectors, by applying innovative technologies, and by
---	---	---

	<p>On action 2.1, we suggest deleting the word ‘key’ as mainstreaming must apply to all economic sectors.</p>	<p>developing and applying positive incentives for the conservation, restoration and sustainable use of biodiversity, consistent and in harmony with the Convention and other relevant international obligations, taking into account national priorities and socioeconomic conditions, <u>and aligning all public and private financial flows with biodiversity objectives.</u></p> <p><u>Rationale: Fiscal tools and positive incentive measures can attribute the true costs of biodiversityharmful activities and reward activities that are biodiversity-friendly.</u></p> <p>Ending, <u>reforming</u> or <u>redirecting</u> reforming incentives, including subsidies, that are harmful to biodiversity is a critical component of incentive alignment <u>and thus a key plank in biodiversity mainstreaming and achieving the goals of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework. Removing biodiversity-harmful subsidies can also liberate scarce financial resources. A more effective use of Strategic Environmental Assessment could be one mechanism to help avoid harmful incentives emanating from new, proposed policies.</u> There will be a need for financial provision to developing countries to fund the national implementation of positive incentives in the global South.</p> <p><u>Action 2.1: Prohibit Phase-out, in key economic sectors, forms of incentives, including subsidies, that are harmful for biodiversity, including by redirecting them to biodiversity-positive activities that are beneficial to biodiversity,</u> eliminate subsidies that contribute to biodiversity-harmful activities, and refrain from introducing new such subsidies, taking into account national socioeconomic conditions, and consistent and in harmony with the Convention and other international obligations.</p> <p><u>Action 2.3: Apply sustainable innovative digital technologies for mainstreaming biodiversity into planning, development, finance and business, in a way that contributes to biodiversity conservation, restoration and sustainable use and</u> protects privacy while providing citizens, the private sector and Governments with access to data and information for better decision-making related to mainstreaming.</p>
--	---	---

Haiti (Financial incentives, see also under headline action 1 above)

Comment Most countries still do not enforce sound fiscal policies to protect biodiversity loss.	Proposal Review and strengthen the existing fiscal policies as it relates to expenditures, incentives and promote adoption of such instruments in countries that are still behind the curve
(applies to both headline action 1 and 2 comments) The headline actions above should be part of biodiversity finance plans developed by national governments.	Provide guidance on fiscal policies to help countries align with LTAM Action Plan

Japan

Comments	Proposals
Not only “eliminating, phasing out and reforming”, but also “repurposing” and “redirecting” are important to increase positive and wiser incentive while reducing existent negative incentives in return. It could result in the double effect.	Mainstream biodiversity in fiscal, budgetary and financial instruments, in particular by eliminating, phasing out, and/or reforming, <u>repurposing and/or redirecting</u> incentives, including subsidies harmful to biodiversity in key economic sectors...and socioeconomic conditions.
For the same reason as above, “repurposing or redirecting” should be added.	Rationale: Ending, or reforming, <u>repurposing or and redirecting</u> incentives, including subsidies, that are harmful to biodiversity is...

Mexico

Mexico supports this Headline action, and as good practices, it is highlighted that Mexico has been innovative in this type of proposal, through its Payment for Environmental Services Program, which has the purpose of promoting the recognition of the value of the environmental services they provide, in addition to supporting the creation of markets for these services through various programs that have been evolving in the current decade. These programs support communities, ejidos, Regional Associations of Foresters and forest landowners.

Switzerland

Switzerland suggests deleting the term “key” prior to economic sector. In this context the term “key” is ambiguous – what does it mean? Key in terms of biodiversity impact? Economic importance? Employment? “key” could be replaced by “relevant” or “critical” economic sectors.		Action area 2. Mainstream biodiversity in fiscal, budgetary and financial instruments, in particular by eliminating, phasing out or reforming incentives, including subsidies harmful to biodiversity in key economic sectors, by applying innovative technologies, and by developing and applying positive incentives for the conservation, restoration and sustainable use of biodiversity, consistent and in harmony with the Convention and other relevant international obligations, taking into account national socioeconomic conditions.
Headline action X	Comments	Proposals
Proposed activity (2.1)	Agreed wording should be used here	Prohibit, i In key relevant economic sectors, eliminate, phase out or reform forms of incentives, including subsidies, that are ...

Uganda

Comments	Proposals
Mainstreaming biodiversity in fiscal, budgetary and financial instruments should not only focus on eliminating/phasing out/reforming incentives including subsidies that are harmful to biodiversity. This strategy should include incorporation of adequate financing or budgeting for biodiversity across sectors within the national budgets or expenditure frameworks	Provide adequate financing for biodiversity conservation across sectors in the national budget as one of the mainstreaming targets in the NBSAP. (The proportion of biodiversity budget or expenditure of the national budget or expenditure framework should be one of the key indicators of mainstreaming)

United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland

Headline Action	Comments	Proposals
Headline action 2	While the UK supports the application of positive incentives and in ending harmful subsidies, we would request that the AHTEG helps define ‘key economic sectors’ as part of its review of the LTAM ahead of SBI-4. We note that the Leaders Pledge for Nature calls of productive sectors, while the OECD calls for ‘agriculture, fishers and other’ sectors. Additionally, Target 18 under the draft framework does not refer to sectors.	[Headline Action 2. Mainstream biodiversity in fiscal, budgetary and financial instruments, in particular by eliminating, phasing out and/or reforming incentives, including subsidies harmful to biodiversity in key economic sectors, by applying innovative technologies, and by developing and applying positive incentives for the conservation, restoration and sustainable use of

	<p>Also, we seek clarity by the secretariat on what is ‘innovative technologies’ and which ones should be used in eliminating, phasing out and reforming harmful subsidies?</p> <p>For now, we would suggest to bracket this text until further clarity is made available.</p>	<p>biodiversity, consistent and in harmony with the Convention and other relevant international obligations, taking into account national priorities and socioeconomic conditions.]</p>
--	--	--

Strategy area II: Integrate nature and biodiversity into business models, operations, and practices of key economic sectors, including the financial sector

Philippines

Yes, business and finance should have separate headline actions.

HEADLINE ACTION 3: Businesses in all relevant economic sectors and at all levels, and especially large and transnational companies and those with the most significant impacts on biodiversity, actively transition towards sustainable technologies and practices, including along their supply, trade and value chains, demonstrating decreasing negative and increasingly net positive impacts on ecosystems and their services to people, biodiversity and human well-being and health.

Belarus

Headline Action 3: Businesses in relevant economic sectors and at micro, small, and medium levels, and especially large and transnational companies, and those with the most significant impacts on biodiversity, actively transition towards sustainable and fair technologies and practices, including along their supply, trade and value chains, demonstrating decreasing negative and increasingly positive impacts on ecosystems and their services to people, biodiversity and human well-being and health, in a manner consistent and in harmony with the Convention and other international obligations.

Belarus: Business and finance to encourage the application of technology and research and development and innovation regarding mainstreaming biodiversity in the sectors of energy and mining, infrastructure, and manufacturing and processing;

Bolivia (Plurinational State of)

Proposed scope: Integrate living in harmony with nature/Mother Earth and sustainable biodiversity management into sustainable business approaches and models, operations and practices of key economic sectors, including the financial sector.

Headline Action	Comments	Proposals
Headline action 3	One of the principal aspects to align sustainable business models and finance is to accept the responsibilities of the economic/financial sector with Mother Earth and their impacts on biodiversity, and then to promote a transition to visions of living in harmony with nature. However, in this practice there may be different visions and approaches, and therefore highlighting only some of them leaves behind others. Therefore, we do prefer not specifying only some policies.	Businesses in relevant economic sectors and at micro, small, and medium levels, and especially large and transnational companies, and those with the most significant impacts on biodiversity, accept responsibilities for their impacts on biodiversity, human rights and rights of Mother Earth, ensuring legal responsibility and accountability, actively transition towards sustainable and fair technologies and practices, including along their supply, trade and value chains, demonstrating decreasing negative and increasingly positive impacts on ecosystems and their services to people, biodiversity and human well-being and health, in a manner consistent and in harmony with the Convention and other international obligations.
Rationale	Mainstreaming biodiversity into sustainable business models should be undertaken on the basis of rights-based approaches as the sustainable way to achieve harmony with nature. All public and private business, especially those with significant impacts on biodiversity, should accept responsibilities and obligations for how their activities impacts on biodiversity and human rights and rights of Mother Earth, from local to global, and progressively reduce negative impacts and increase positive impacts, through regulation of their activities, imposing penalties for infractions, ensuring liability and redress for damage and addressing conflicts of interest, and moving towards the full sustainability of extraction and production practices, sourcing and supply chains, and use and disposal.	

Brazil

Headline Action	Comments	Proposals
Headline action 3	<p>From the outset, Brazil believes that the current phrasing of Headline Action 3 places an emphasis on measures to reduce the negative impacts on biodiversity from key economic sectors and to integrate biodiversity in the corresponding decision-making processes. While addressing those negative impacts is critical to the mainstreaming agenda, Brazil believes due attention should be given to innovative business models that can harness the potential of the private sector to foster the conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity. Brazil also understands that the language of Headline Action 3 needs to be improved to maintain coherence with the Sustainable Development Goals, in particular SDGs 9 and 12.</p> <p>Brazil also remains concerned regarding the use of expression “fair”, as the term lends itself to ambiguity as to what outcome is expected to be achieved. Brazil believes that the word “inclusive” provides a more clear terminology and would be consistent with the</p>	<p>Brazil suggests the following amendments to Headline Action 3:</p> <p>Headline Action 3: Businesses in relevant economic sectors and at micro, small, and medium levels, and especially large and transnational companies, and those with the most significant impacts on biodiversity, actively transition towards sustainable and inclusive and fair technologies and practices, fostering innovation and the development of biodiversity-based products and enhancing compliance with access and benefit-sharing frameworks and legislation, including along their supply, trade and value chains, demonstrating decreasing negative</p>

Headline Action	Comments	Proposals
	<p>2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development and the SDGs (e.g. SDG 9.2).</p> <p>In addition, Brazil understands that additional emphasis must be placed on the important role of innovation to foster the sustainable use of biodiversity and provide conservation co-benefits. From the perspective of megadiverse countries, biodiversity holds the potential to unlock long-term investments from the private sector in scientific research activities that contribute to the development of a wide range of innovative products derived from biodiversity, such as biobased inputs (e.g. biofibers, biofertilizers, amongst other). Those innovative products may help reduce the consumption of traditional inputs that generate higher environmental impacts and foster the transition towards Sustainable Consumption and Production Patterns. Therefore, countries and companies must be encouraged to support innovative business models that stimulate the design and development of biodiversity-based products, such as bioeconomy.</p> <p>Furthermore, Brazil believes that the effective mainstreaming of biodiversity within the business sector requires the application and enforcement of solid ABS national frameworks, and companies must be encouraged to develop internal policies to ensure compliance with existing ABS legislation. This is to ensure that scientific research activities are carried in a manner respectful of the rights of IPLCs, thus contributing to protecting traditional knowledge and supporting sustainable livelihoods.</p> <p>Brazil would also like to express concerns regarding some specific instruments that have been referred to under the “Rationale” sub-section, such as certification, eco-labelling, and B2B. High costs to obtain certification and meet requirements from reporting and certification agencies could place a disproportionate burden on small and medium-sized producers, in particular IPLCs, and may eventually harm the capacity of those producers and communities to gain access to markets, with detrimental impacts on income generation. Due attention should therefore be given to specifics of small and medium-sized enterprises.</p> <p>Brazil would also like to draw attention to topics that fall out of the scope of mainstreaming agenda.</p>	<p>and increasingly positive impacts on ecosystems and their services to people, biodiversity and human well-being and health, in a manner consistent and in harmony with the Convention and other international obligations, in particular obligations under the World Trade Organization.</p> <p>Rationale: Integrating biological diversity, and ecosystem service values, into economic sectors enables the achievement of necessary changes in production and consumption, such as incorporating naturebased solutions to production chains, and the reduction of resource waste at all levels of production and consumption. Such transformative actions can be induced through financial and sectorial policies but can also be encouraged by engaging relevant businesses and their associations. Efforts to mainstream biodiversity within the business sector should also consider the need to strengthen the scientific and technological capacity of developing countries to move towards more sustainable patterns of consumption and production, as recognized by SDG 12, in particular SDG 12.a. Financial and sectorial policies must also harness the capabilities of the business sector to innovate to scale up investments in scientific research activities, including biotechnologies, that stimulate the development of sustainable biodiversity-based products, including biobased inputs, contributing to the conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity. Businesses, according to international standards, already account for the values, dependencies and impacts on biodiversity throughout their supply</p>

Headline Action	Comments	Proposals
	<p>Brazil recommends extreme caution when introducing references to “trade chains”, as trade-related international obligations must be addressed primarily under the World Trade Organization. Efforts to address the interlinkages between biodiversity and trade must be implemented in facilitative and non-punitive manner, being fully respectful of existing international obligations. Those efforts should aim at facilitating and increasing market access for products derived from biodiversity, rather than introducing new trade barriers that will lead to further inefficiencies and market distortions, with detrimental impacts on the environmental. Given the complexity of those interlinkages, Brazil believes that the CBD community is not well positioned to address those topics, and proposals in this regard risk encroaching on the mandate of the relevant multilateral organizations.</p> <p>In addition, Brazil requests deleting references to “nature-based solutions”. In line with Brazil’s position during the negotiations of the Post-2020 GBF, Brazil would like to recall that the UNEA 5.2 Resolution on “Nature-based solutions” has established a process for intergovernmental consultations regarding criteria for the implementation of this new conceptual framework. Therefore, Brazil is of the view that the CBD community should await the outcomes of this intergovernmental process, prior to incorporating this new concept in its work programme. Brazil would also like to draw attention to the recent contribution of Working Group II to Sixth Assessment Report of IPCC, which states that NbS is not universally used in the scientific literature and highlights concerns that its use may lead to the misunderstanding that NbS on its own could provide a global solution to environmental challenges. That being so, Brazil would like to emphasize the importance of preserving conceptual frameworks that were previously agreed upon under the Convention, in particular the concept of Ecosystem-based Approaches, which has been extensively discussed by the CBD community and has been spelled out in detail in many COP decisions.</p>	<p>chains, and can adopt sustainable practices to support the conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity and can integrate sustainability information in their reporting cycle, according to agreed methodologies. At the same time, there is room for improvement in reporting information relevant to the three objectives of the Convention, including on internal company policies to ensure compliance with access and benefit sharing frameworks and legislation. They can also be partners in the design and implementation of positive incentive measures for biodiversity, using science-based and verifiable information on biodiversity in consumer and producer decisions, consistent and in harmony with the Convention and other relevant international obligations. Particular attention should be given to the specifics of small and medium-sized enterprises, in particular family-based and small-scale activities, including in indigenous peoples and local communities, for example through the application of the mitigation hierarchy, certification, eco-labelling or B2B standards, as appropriate.</p>

Canada

Outcomes of discussion on T15 should be considered when developing this headline indicator. The headline action should not duplicate the target language.

European Union and its member States

<p>Headline action 3</p>	<p>Proposal to keep the actions (as presented in CBD/SBI/3/13), as well as amendments</p>	<p>Headline action 3: Businesses in all relevant economic sectors and at micro, small, and medium levels, and especially <u>those with the most significant impacts on biodiversity, including</u> large and transnational companies, <u>as well as those at micro, small, and medium levels</u>, and those with the most significant impacts on biodiversity, actively transition towards sustainable and fair technologies and practices, including along their supply, trade and value chains, avoiding and demonstrating decreasing negative and increasingly positive impacts on ecosystems and their services to people, biodiversity and human well-being and health, in a manner consistent and in harmony with the Convention and other international obligations.</p> <p>Rationale: Integrating biological diversity, and ecosystem service values, into economic sectors enables the achievement of necessary changes in production and consumption, such as incorporating nature-based solutions to production chains, and the reduction of resource consumption and waste at all levels of production and consumption. Such transformative actions can be induced through financial and sectorial policies but can also be encouraged by engaging relevant businesses and their associations. Businesses, according to international standards, should already account for the values, dependencies and impacts on biodiversity throughout their supply chains, and can adopt sustainable practices to support the conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity and can integrate sustainability information in their reporting cycle, according to agreed methodologies. They can also be partners in the design and implementation of positive incentive measures for biodiversity, using science-based and verifiable information on biodiversity in consumer and producer decisions, consistent and in harmony with the Convention and other relevant international obligations, for example through the application of the mitigation hierarchy, certification, eco-labelling or B2B standards, as appropriate.</p> <p>Action 3.1: in line with <u>Taking into account the IPBES Business and Biodiversity Assessment that is to be developed</u>, Bbusinesses apply an agreed set of biodiversity metrics, ecosystem accounts, and reporting and disclosure standards, based on dependencies and net impact measurement, integrating the values of biodiversity⁷ and their role in business models and ensuring that the values, dependencies and impacts on biodiversity including throughout their supply chains are accounted for according to international generally accepted principles and codes of conduct.</p> <p>Action 3.2: Businesses at all levels transition to sustainable production practices, maximizing net positive impacts on nature, biodiversity and human health, applying the mitigation hierarchy, <u>further integrating nature-based solutions as defined in UNEP/EA5/L9</u> while managing dependencies and avoiding or minimizing negative impacts, over-exploitation and pollution, including in business models and through voluntary standards, labelling and sustainability certification, and provide verifiable</p>
---------------------------------	---	---

		<p>evidence of change, such as traceability of biodiversity impacts and transparency in supply chains and ingredients. <u>Businesses develop effective mechanisms to include affected local populations in the development and implementation of their strategies.</u></p> <p>Action 3.3: Governments at all levels, rights holders, the private sector and civil society collaborate to establish and strengthen mechanisms to encourage and promote business commitments to biodiversity and partnerships which enable collaboration and communication at all levels.</p>
--	--	---

To fill the gaps on several sectors, especially productive sectors and/or land/sea use sectors, further work is needed on the strategy area. Maybe adding a new action area under strategy area 2 or adding a new strategy area on productive/land/sea use sectors could be envisaged. Sectoral international and regional Conventions, Agreements, Organizations and Institutions have an important role and should be identified as actors in the LTAM and its AP where appropriate. The CBD Secretariat should ensure that this is covered by the broader process on synergies and by the COP Decision on synergies/cooperation. In order to avoid overlapping, duplication or parallel processes, the EU+MS highlight the necessity for alignment with, and support to, the GBF.

As the post 2020-GBF includes already some elements concerning agriculture, forestry, fisheries and aquaculture, additional sectoral actions to be included in the LTAM and its Action Plan may especially be useful for other economic sectors such as energy/mining, health and infrastructure or cross cutting activities (trade/supply chain and social safety nets). Therefore, the EU+MS think that the AP should make use of the opportunity to explicitly address sectors that account for the most important direct and indirect pressures on biodiversity according to the IPBES Global Assessment and the GBO-5. The LTAM and its AP need to reflect and build on the international findings and thus contribute to achieving transformational change. For example, IPBES does identify energy, mining and infrastructure as sectors with a clear impact on biodiversity.

United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland

Comments	Proposals
<p>The UK request this remains brackets until target 15 text is agreed up which can be reflected within this headline action.</p>	<p>[Headline Action 3: Businesses in relevant economic sectors and at micro, small, and medium levels, and especially large and transnational companies, and those with the most significant impacts on biodiversity, actively transition towards sustainable and fair product services process, technologies and practices, including along their supply, trade and value chains, demonstrating decreasing negative and increasingly positive impacts on ecosystems and their services to people, biodiversity and human well-being and health, in a manner consistent and in harmony with the Convention and other international obligations.]</p>

HEADLINE ACTION 4: Financial institutions at all levels apply biodiversity risk assessment policies and processes, having developed tools for biodiversity financing to demonstrate decreasing negative impacts on ecosystems and biodiversity in their portfolios and increasing amounts of dedicated finance.

Belarus

<p>Headline Action 4: Financial institutions at all levels apply biodiversity risk and impact assessment policies and processes, having developed tools for biodiversity financing to demonstrate decreasing negative impacts on ecosystems and biodiversity in their portfolios and increasing amounts of dedicated finance, to support sustainable business models and foster the conservation and the sustainable use of biodiversity.</p>
<p>Belarus Business and finance to work with indigenous peoples and local communities and all relevant stakeholders across the public, private and civil society sectors in order to establish and strengthen coordination mechanisms to facilitate addressing the underlying causes of biodiversity loss and foster biodiversity mainstreaming across all sectors</p>

Brazil

<p>Headline action 4</p>	<p>Brazil understands that the uptake of biodiversity risk and impact assessment policies and processes should aim at leveraging resources for sustainable business models that foster innovation, efficiency and productivity, thus reducing pressures on biodiversity.</p> <p>Brazil would suggest deleting the expression “nature ambition” as it lacks clarity regarding the outcomes that are expected.</p> <p>While Brazil attaches importance to the role of financial institutions, Brazil is of the view that the Headline Action and its Rationale should account for the capacity and institutional gaps faced by developing countries, where many financial institutions are unable to implement environmental risk and impact assessment policies. Therefore, Brazil remains concerned that many developing countries may struggle to comply with governance standards that address biodiversity issues, which may further aggravate the lack of access to financial flows. From our perspective, efforts to mainstream biodiversity within the financial sector should aim primarily at facilitating access to financial flows that contribute to the conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity. Therefore, measures to be developed by financial institutions must be designed on an inclusive,</p>	<p>Brazil suggests the following amendments to Headline Action 4:</p> <p>Headline Action 4: Financial institutions at all levels apply biodiversity risk and impact assessment policies and processes, having developed tools for biodiversity financing to demonstrate decreasing negative impacts on ecosystems and biodiversity in their portfolios and increasing amounts of dedicated finance, to support sustainable business models that stimulate innovation, efficiency and productivity and foster the conservation and the sustainable use of biodiversity, recognizing the importance of increasing and facilitating access to the financial system, in particular in developing countries, and taking into account their specific capacity and institutional gaps and the specifics of small and medium-sized enterprises and the need of preventing double counting.</p> <p>Rationale: Financial flows need to be consistent with a pathway towards the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development and its SDGs, towards living in harmony with nature and the three objectives of the Convention and redirected towards achieving the nature ambition. Public and private finance should be aligned more effectively with the three objectives of the</p>
--------------------------	---	---

	<p>transparent and bottom-up basis, with a view to enhancing access to the financial system, in particular in developing countries and taking into account the challenges faced by small and medium-sized enterprises.</p> <p>Brazil also believes a transparent and inclusive approach is needed to refine metrics available to identify and measure biodiversity-specific funding. As the mainstreaming of environmental issues within the financial sector has been gaining traction, it is important to understand to what extent ongoing initiatives from financial institutions are effectively contributing to increasing financing for activities that enhance the conservation and the sustainable use of biodiversity, otherwise we may risk incurring in double counting and overestimating the amount of resources from financial institutions dedicated to biodiversity.</p>	<p>Convention and seek to scale up resources to the conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity and support local communities, foster innovative and sustainable business models and address the challenges faced by small and medium-sized enterprises. Due attention should be given to the capabilities and institutional gaps that undermine developing countries' capacity to implement biodiversity risk and impact assessment policies and processes. The focus in the global framework should broaden from “also financing green projects” to “greening the financial system as a whole”, facilitating access to financial flows for activities that contribute to the conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity. Enhanced efforts will also be needed to ensure transparent measurement of biodiversity-specific funding, with a view to preventing double counting.</p>
--	---	---

Canada

Outcomes of discussion on T15 should be considered when developing this headline indicator. The headline action should not duplicate the target language.

European Union and its member States

<p>Headline action 4</p>	<p>Proposal to keep the actions (as presented in CBD/SBI/3/13), as well as amendments</p>	<p>Headline Action 4: Financial institutions at all levels apply biodiversity risk and impact assessment policies and processes, having developed tools for biodiversity financing to demonstrate decreasing negative impacts on ecosystems and biodiversity in their portfolios and increasing amounts of dedicated finance, to support sustainable business models and foster the conservation and the sustainable use of biodiversity.</p> <p>Rationale: Financial flows need to be consistent with a pathway towards living in harmony with nature and redirected towards achieving the nature ambition. Public and private finance should be aligned more effectively with the three objectives of the Convention and seek to scale up resources to the conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity and support local communities and the focus in the <u>post-2020</u> global biodiversity framework should broaden from “also financing green projects” to “greening the financial system as a whole”.</p> <p>Action 4.1: Financial institutions at all levels apply and engage with their clients on an agreed and verifiable set of</p>
---------------------------------	---	---

		<p>biodiversity metrics, reporting and disclosure standards, based on dependencies and net impact measurement and integrating the values of biodiversity in investment portfolios and lending decisions.</p> <p>Action 4.2: Financial institutions at all levels incorporate biodiversity loss in their risk analyses and have increasing net positive impacts on biodiversity, including by financing activities that can verifiably demonstrate biodiversity benefits or co-benefits.</p> <p>Action 4.3: Financial institutions apply, and promote the use of, tools such as green investments, impact loans, blended finance and parametric insurance.</p> <p>Action 4.4: Partnerships are established or strengthened with a view to promoting financial institutions' commitments to biodiversity and collaboration and communication at all levels.</p>
--	--	--

Haiti

Comments	Proposals
Accountability measures could be agreed upon to promote transparency	Promote/catalyse mixed public/private sector working groups to improve transparency around mainstreaming biodiversity
It is probably a good idea to separate Business and Finance	

United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland

The UK Supports this headline action.

ADDITIONAL HEADLINE ACTION:

Bolivia (Plurinational State of)

Headline action 4bis	Indigenous peoples and local communities' business models must be enhanced and supported across all levels of governments, as stewards of biodiversity and as leading ways of living in harmony with nature.	Community business models of indigenous peoples and local communities are promoted and strengthened as sustainable ways to enhance sustainable use of biodiversity, articulating sustainable use related products with national, regional and international markets, through relevant financial models and technical and financial cooperation.
Rationale	Integrating biological diversity into business models will be enriched through the development of policies and strategies across all levels of governments, to enhance, promote and strengthen indigenous peoples and local communities' business models based on community and collective action, recognizing the leading role of communities in conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity, and in ways of living in harmony with nature and Mother Earth.	

Strategy area III: Mainstreaming biodiversity across society

HEADLINE ACTION 5: People everywhere have relevant information, awareness and capacities for sustainable development and lifestyles that are in harmony with nature, reflecting the values of biodiversity and their central role in people’s lives and livelihoods, and take gender-specific measurable steps towards sustainable consumption and lifestyles, taking into account individual and national socioeconomic conditions.

Belarus

<p>Headline Action 5: People everywhere have relevant information, awareness and capacities for sustainable development and lifestyles that are in harmony with nature, reflecting the multi-faceted values⁶ of biological diversity and its components,⁷ and their central role in people’s lives and livelihoods, and take gender-specific measurable steps towards sustainable consumption and lifestyles, taking into account individual and national socioeconomic conditions.</p>
<p>Belarus</p> <p>Governments to establish knowledge platforms to bring together government agencies at different levels, the business sector, indigenous peoples and local communities and stakeholders to address the technical issues with respect to mainstreaming biodiversity, taking into account matters related to environmental stewardship and corporate social responsibility.</p>

Bolivia (Plurinational State of)

Headline Action	Comments	Proposals
Headline action 5	People information and awareness must be broad and should take into account key aspects such as rights-based approaches, equity, common but differentiated responsibilities, and others, in order to take strong steps towards a world with just and better living conditions.	Headline Action 5: People everywhere have relevant information, awareness and capacities for sustainable development and lifestyles that are in harmony with nature and Mother Earth, considering rights-based approaches, equity and common but differentiated responsibilities, reflecting social justice, and intergenerational equity, and reflecting the multiple multi-faceted values of biological diversity and its components, different knowledge systems, including those of indigenous peoples and local communities and intercultural approaches, and their central role in people’s lives and livelihoods, and take gender-responsive specific-measures able steps towards sustainable consumption and lifestyles, taking into account individual and national socioeconomic conditions.

⁶ The intrinsic, ecological, genetic, social economic, scientific, educational, cultural, recreational and aesthetic values of biological diversity and its components; see decision X/9, para. 9(b)(ii).

⁷ Sustainable Development Goal 12.8, with amendment to reflect the role of biodiversity values and actions taken.

Rationale	Mainstreaming biodiversity across society actors requires a broad and deep understanding of key aspects such as social justice, equity, common but differentiated responsibilities, intergenerational equity, rights-based approaches, and gender-responsive needs among others, in order to strengthen individual and collective lifestyles and sustainable patterns of production and consumption, in particular through education and public awareness.
-----------	--

Brazil

Headline action 5	<p>Brazil understands that Headline Action 5 provides an opportunity to strengthen the interlinkages between the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development and its SDGs and the conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity.</p> <p>While SDG 12 plays an important role in mainstreaming biodiversity across society, Brazil believes that disproportionate emphasis has been placed on consumption choices and some elements from other SDGs of crucial importance for developing countries have been neglected, in particular the role of biodiversity-based activities in supporting poverty eradication efforts (SDG 1), ensuring inclusive and equitable quality education and promote lifelong learning opportunities for all (SDG 4), promoting full and productive employment and decent work for all (SDG 8) and fostering innovation and sustainable industrialization (SDG 9).</p> <p>As the COVID-19 pandemic has placed additional strain on national economies, Headline Action 5 provides a powerful tool to raise awareness on how the sustainable use of biodiversity can support a sustainable, inclusive and resilient recovery from the pandemic, contributing to addressing a number of social and economic challenges that have been further exacerbated by the pandemic, such as persistent levels of poverty, including extreme poverty, inequalities and unemployment. It is thus essential to highlight the interlinkages between biodiversity and sustainable livelihoods and the three dimensions of sustainable development. This would require enhancing access to training and</p>	<p>Brazil suggests the following amendments to Headline Action 5:</p> <p>Headline Action 5: People everywhere have relevant information, awareness and capacities for sustainable development and lifestyles that are in harmony with nature, reflecting the multifaceted values of biological diversity and its components, and their central role in people’s lives and livelihoods, and take gender-specific measurable steps towards sustainable consumption and lifestyles, taking into account individual and national socioeconomic conditions. People have access to job and income-generating opportunities that contribute to the conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity and to poverty eradication efforts and acquire the knowledge and skills needed to promote sustainable development, including in the fields of biodiversity conservation and sustainable use. Policies and measures are implemented to enhance scientific research, upgrade the technological capabilities of countries, in particular developing countries, to foster the development of biodiversity-based activities that support sustainable livelihoods, thus raising awareness on the social, economic and environmental benefits of biodiversity. Due attention should be given to gender-specific needs and gaps.</p> <p>Rationale: Mainstreaming across society relates to the gendered impacts (positive and negative) which individuals and groups have on biodiversity, to the social, economic and cultural benefits which ecosystems and biodiversity provide, as well as the spiritual and intrinsic values of biodiversity, which is of particular importance to indigenous peoples and local communities central to decisions taken about biodiversity, especially in their lands and territories, taking into account</p>
-------------------	---	--

	<p>lifelong learning and qualification opportunities so as to develop the skills and knowledge needed to strengthen conservation and sustainable use activities.</p> <p>Brazil would request deleting expressions that lack a multilaterally-agreed upon definition, such as ecological footprint, which prejudices the best policy tool for the implementation of SDG 12, as we are of the view that there is not a “one-size-fits-all approach” for the implementation of SDG 12.</p> <p>Brazil also believes that access to training, education and capacity building relates to a wide range of policy objectives other than supporting decision-making processes, such as development-oriented policies that support biodiversity-based productive activities, decent job creation, entrepreneurship, creativity and innovation, and encourage the formalization and growth of micro-, small- and medium-sized enterprises that contribute to the conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity, including in local communities. Therefore, the manner in which the topic of access to training is framed within the rationale requires further adjustments so as to reflect other policy objectives.</p> <p>Brazil understands that Headline Action 5 should address the ways to mainstreaming biodiversity across the society as a whole, while recognizing the importance of addressing gender-specific needs and the role of IPLCs when implementing actions to support Headline Action 5.</p>	<p>gender-specific impacts. It also relates to the steps that can be taken, individually and collectively, to conserve and sustainably use biodiversity, for instance by adopting or strengthening sustainable lifestyles and consumption patterns, enhancing access to training opportunities and capacity building for developing skills and knowledge related to the conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity, promoting development-oriented policies that support biodiversity-based productive activities, decent job creation, entrepreneurship, creativity and innovation, and encourage the formalization and growth of micro-, small- and medium-sized enterprises that contribute to the conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity, including in local communities that reduce ecological footprints. Mainstreaming biodiversity across society can also be achieved, for instance, by identifying gender-specific needs for and creating access to training, education and capacity building on biological diversity to supporting participatory, inclusive and equitable decision making processes, recognizing the importance of addressing of gender-specific needs, strengthening traditional knowledge systems, creating access to environmental education that enables the understanding of the social, economic and environmental benefits of biodiversity, including those related to health, to health education and the impacts of environmental stressors and benefits to health, and making use of evidence-based communication tools for public awareness</p>
--	--	---

Canada

Comments	Proposals
<p>A reference to health would be appropriate in this section</p>	<p>People everywhere have relevant information, awareness and capacities for sustainable development and lifestyles that are in harmony with nature, reflecting the multi-faceted values¹ of biological diversity and its components,² and their central role in people’s health, lives and livelihoods, and take gender-specific measurable steps towards sustainable consumption and lifestyles, taking into account individual and national socioeconomic conditions.</p>

Haiti

Comments	Proposals
Cultural norms should be considered to improve mainstreaming biodiversity across society	Establish environmental education programs in schools as a transversal theme across departments
Churches, community organizations, schools can play an important role in sensitizing society on the value of biodiversity and the need for conservation	

United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland

The UK has provided a very minor textual addition under HA5.	Headline Action 5: People everywhere have relevant information, awareness and capacities for sustainable development and lifestyles that are in harmony with nature, reflecting the multi-faceted values¹¹ of biological diversity and its components,¹² and their central role in people’s lives and livelihoods, and take gender-specific measurable steps towards sustainable consumption choices and lifestyles, taking into account individual and national socioeconomic conditions.
A more substantive change can be found under the rationale which we believe should include the following as we should be recognising the differentiated gendered impacts of biodiversity loss on people (particularly women and girls) within mainstreaming,	Rationale: Mainstreaming across society relates to the gendered impacts (positive and negative) which individuals and groups have on biodiversity as well as the gendered impacts experienced due to biodiversity loss, to the social and cultural benefits which ecosystems and biodiversity provide, as well as the spiritual and intrinsic values of biodiversity, which is of particular importance to indigenous peoples and local communities central to decisions taken about biodiversity, especially in their lands and territories. It also relates to the steps that can be taken, individually and collectively, to conserve and sustainably use biodiversity, for instance by adopting or strengthening sustainable lifestyles and consumption patterns that reduce ecological footprints. Mainstreaming can be achieved, for instance, by identifying gender-specific needs for and creating access to training, education and capacity-building on biological diversity to support participatory, inclusive and equitable decision-making processes, strengthening traditional knowledge systems, creating access to health education and the impacts of environmental stressors and benefits to health, and making use of evidence based communication tools for public awareness.
