



Convention on Biological Diversity

Distr.
GENERAL

CBD/POST2020/WS/2019/6/2
4 August 2019

ENGLISH ONLY

REPORT OF THE CONSULTATION WORKSHOP OF BIODIVERSITY-RELATED CONVENTIONS ON THE POST-2020 GLOBAL BIODIVERSITY FRAMEWORK, BERN, 10-12 JUNE 2019

I. BACKGROUND AND PURPOSE

1. At its fourteenth meeting, the Conference of the Parties to the Convention on Biological Diversity adopted a decision setting out a preparatory process for preparation of a post-2020 global biodiversity framework ([decision 14/34](#)). Other decisions of the Conference of the Parties contain relevant elements.¹ In [decision 14/30](#) (para. 12), the Conference of the Parties requested organization of a workshop to facilitate discussions among Parties to the various biodiversity-related conventions to explore ways in which they could contribute to the post-2020 framework and identify elements for inclusion. The present workshop was organized to respond to that request.

2. Hosted and sponsored by the Government of Switzerland, the workshop was held at the headquarters of the Universal Postal Union in Bern from 10 to 12 June 2019. The United Nations Environment Programme also contributed to its funding. It convened representatives of Parties to the eight global conventions represented in the Liaison Group of Biodiversity-related Conventions and the two Rio conventions.² Government representatives of the Parties to the conventions were nominated by each convention from the bureaux or other standing bodies and committees in a manner to ensure regional balance. In the case of the Convention on Biological Diversity, members of the Bureau of the Conference of the Parties, the chairpersons of its two subsidiary bodies, the Co-Chairs of the Open-ended Working Group on the Post-2020 Global Biodiversity Framework and members of the Convention's informal advisory group on synergies³ were also selected according to regional balance and participated to ensure that insights from the workshop would inform negotiation of the post-2020 framework effectively. The workshop was attended by about 120 participants, of whom half were government representatives of Parties to the conventions and half were representatives or technical experts from the secretariats of relevant organizations, the conventions and other processes.

3. The aims of the workshop were to identify:

¹ For an overview of these decisions, see [CBD/POST2020/PREP/1/1](#).

² The eight conventions represented in the Liaison Group of Biodiversity-related Conventions are: the Convention concerning the Protection of the World Cultural and Natural Heritage (World Heritage Convention (WHC)), Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD), Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species of Wild Fauna and Flora (CITES), Convention on the Conservation of Migratory Species of Wild Animals (CMS), Convention on Wetlands of International Importance especially as Waterfowl Habitat (Ramsar Convention on Wetlands), International Plant Protection Convention (IPPC), International Treaty on Plant Genetic Resources for Food and Agriculture (ITPGRFA) and International Whaling Commission (IWC). The Rio conventions are CBD, the United Nations Convention to Combat Desertification (UNCCD) and the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC).

³ In decision 14/30 (para. 10), the mandate of the informal advisory group was extended to include “provid[ing] the Secretariat and the open-ended working group...with advice on ways to optimize synergies among the biodiversity-related conventions in the development of the post-2020 biodiversity framework”.

(a) Ways in which the conventions could further contribute to the development of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework;

(b) How the areas of work under other conventions could be reflected in the framework and contribute to its implementation, in order to maximize its common relevance and applicability as a global framework;

(c) Specific elements to be included in the framework according to the mandate, strategy and vision of each convention;

(d) Areas of cross-cutting importance to the conventions, such as capacity-building, resource mobilization and communications,⁴ that could be reflected in the framework;

(e) Possible elements that could be included in the framework to increase synergy among the biodiversity-related conventions (such as harmonized reporting and improved coordination among national focal points).

4. The expected outputs of the workshop were suggestions:

(a) To the Open-ended Working Group on the Post-2020 Global Biodiversity Framework and, through appropriate means, to the relevant bodies of the conventions for their consideration;

(b) To the Open-ended Working Group on how the areas of work under other conventions could be reflected in the framework;

(c) To the Open-ended Working Group on the form and content of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework that would make it holistic and benefits from implementation of each of the biodiversity-related conventions;

(d) On aspects of the framework that would increase synergy among the conventions.

5. A further important objective of the workshop was to provide an initial opportunity for consideration of the role of each convention in the development and implementation of a post-2020 global biodiversity framework to ensure shared ownership and common goals.

II. Views on elements that could be included in the framework and ways in which the conventions could further contribute to its development

6. This section summarizes views expressed by participants concerning the workshop's objectives to identify ways in which other conventions could contribute to the preparation of the post-2020 framework and elements that could be included, according to the respective mandates of the conventions. It should not be interpreted in any way as a consensus nor as recommendation but, rather, as potential input for further discussions in the development of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework.

A. Elements that could be included in the post-2020 global biodiversity framework

7. Participants provided suggestions on elements that could be included in the framework. These included suggestions that the post-2020 global biodiversity framework should:

(a) Align with the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development and the Sustainable Development Goals and their targets and indicators; and that it should provide a common framework for countries to address their commitments under the Sustainable Development Goals and their national biodiversity strategies and action plans;

(b) Provide explicit reference to the other related conventions and reflect their objectives and work that relates to biodiversity;

(c) Cross-reference the strategic frameworks of other conventions that are already established for the post-2020 period (for example the CITES Strategic Vision 2021–2030 and its Vision Statement; the Ramsar Strategic Plan for 2016-2024 and; the IPCC Strategic Framework for 2020-2030);

⁴ The issues of capacity-building and resource mobilization will be addressed in dedicated workshops to be held later in 2019.

- (d) Provide clarity on the role of the various conventions in implementing the framework, including potentially, as lead partners for their areas of focus;
- (e) Provide roles for other organizations relevant to the implementation of the conventions, including those of the United Nations system;
- (f) Provide a mechanism for sharing of experiences of the different conventions to identify similarities and resolve differences;
- (g) Include an accountability framework that enables coordination between assessments, indicators and national reporting under the various conventions, including the potential for harmonization of data management and reporting; that takes into account accountability frameworks established under related conventions and their systems for monitoring; and that enables a relevant involvement of non-Party stakeholders;
- (h) Make use of targets and indicators of the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development and other multilateral environmental agreements;
- (i) Include an implementation framework that provides for a more coordinated approach among conventions for cross-cutting issues of common need, including resource mobilization, capacity-building and communications; and that promotes cooperation among national focal points and authorities responsible for the various conventions;
- (j) Include an enabling component for capacity-building and resource mobilization relevant to the implementation of the related conventions;
- (k) Provide attention to the need for international cooperation for implementation of the new framework, at the bilateral, regional and/or global level;
- (l) Include a coherent, comprehensive and innovative communication strategy that demonstrates the contribution of nature to the well-being of people. A common communication strategy could emphasize intergenerational justice and the responsibility for future generations and include positive messages around ecosystem restoration and sustainable use;
- (m) Make a business case for biodiversity in support of human needs and livelihoods;
- (n) Provide mechanisms for engaging the wider public, youth and the productive sectors;
- (o) Establish an easily communicated overarching target, supported by an implementation and monitoring framework at various levels;
- (p) Address direct and indirect drivers of biodiversity loss, including subsidies harmful to biodiversity; and promote the mainstreaming of biodiversity in related sectors including with goals and targets established by other multilateral environmental agreements;
- (q) Take into account new and innovative technology, adapted institutional mechanisms, finance and education;
- (r) Include linkages between the biodiversity and chemicals and wastes processes under the [Strategic Approach to International Chemicals Management](#) (SAICM), the [Basil](#), [Rotterdam](#) and [Stockholm](#) conventions and the Minamata Convention, including with respect, where relevant, to common targets and indicators, communication and messaging, and linked scientific activities related to emerging issues;
- (s) Include the link of biodiversity to culture and the contribution of nature to the well-being of people;
- (t) Recognize the contributions of other conventions in the engagement of indigenous peoples and local communities;
- (u) Reflect the concept of “connectivity”;

- (v) Retain area-based targets but provide more emphasis on connectivity, intactness, management capacity, effectiveness and stewardship by indigenous peoples and local communities; establish spatially explicit targets for species habitat, ecosystem services, connectivity;
- (w) Address the threats to cetaceans, which have relevance to biodiversity more broadly;
- (x) Provide strengthened attention to inland waters and wetlands as well as coastal wetlands;
- (y) Provide attention to soil as an integrating element for broader actions, including water retention in landscapes and productivity;
- (z) Include plant health as a component and highlight invasive alien species that are plant pests;
- (aa) Maintain and strengthen targets for plant genetic resources for food and agriculture, recognizing common and shared responsibility for genetic diversity at the global, national and local levels, and including wild relatives;
- (bb) More strongly address benefit-sharing, including from sustainable use;
- (cc) Integrate the Global Forest Goals and targets;
- (dd) Establish a prominent link with the United Nations Decade on Ecosystem Restoration (2021–2030).⁵

8. The discussions indicated (a) that each convention could contribute to the overarching goal of the framework; (b) that all convention activities converged on human well-being which provided a rationale for the linkages; (c) that the post-2020 framework provided an opportunity for increased cooperation among the conventions and increased efficiency; (d) that coordination of implementation mechanisms, national legislation or institutional arrangements could increase accountability; and (e) that a more integrated system of reporting would result in efficiencies for Parties.

B. Ways in which other conventions could further contribute to the preparation of the framework

9. Participants provided suggestions on ways in which other conventions could further contribute to the preparation of the framework. They included:

- (a) Coordination and consultations among focal points of the conventions at the national level, with a responsibility of CBD national focal points to initiate and be proactive in this. Some convention bodies (for example, ITPGRFA Governing Body and CITES Standing Committee) had formally encouraged national focal points to liaise with their CBD counterparts in the preparation of the post-2020 framework to ensure that priorities of conventions were included in its development;
- (b) Participation of other conventions and their secretariats in other thematic consultations held during the preparatory process;⁶
- (c) Participation of the conventions (Party representation and/or secretariats) in the meetings of the Open-ended Working Group on the Post-2020 Global Biodiversity Framework;
- (d) Possibility of holding a meeting of the conventions and their secretariats at the margins of the first meeting of the open-ended working group on the post-2020 global biodiversity framework;
- (e) Possibility of holding a second consultation workshop of related conventions on the post-2020 global biodiversity framework;

⁵ See General Assembly resolution [73/284](#).

⁶ Thematic consultations are expected to include: biosafety and the Cartagena Protocol (Nairobi, 25 August 2019); access and benefit-sharing and the Nagoya Protocol (Nairobi, 25 August 2019); ecosystem restoration (Brazil, October 2019); the marine environment (Montreal, 6-8 November 2019); communication (Montreal, November 2019); area-based conservation measures (fourth quarter of 2019); resource mobilization (first quarter 2020); capacity-building (February 2020).

(f) Convene further consultations among the conventions, as a “partnership of equals”, to identify how their various priorities could be reflected in the framework and how they could work more effectively together both in shaping and implementing the framework;

(g) Possibility of holding a meeting of the Presidents of the governing bodies of the related conventions;

(h) Holding a meeting of the Liaison Group of Biodiversity-related Conventions focused on the post-2020 global biodiversity framework as soon as possible;

(i) Providing an online exchange platform to support dialogue among parties to the conventions on the post-2020 process and framework;

(j) Ensuring cross-participation of secretariats between the biodiversity, chemicals and wastes processes under SAICM and Basel, Rotterdam and Stockholm conventions;⁷

(k) Addressing the matter of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework in the statutory meetings of the conventions, including those of their governing bodies that would be held before the fifteenth meeting of the Conference of the Parties to the Convention on Biological Diversity. CMS had established a working group on the post-2020 framework;

(l) Possibility of joint actions or statements during relevant high-level events, to promote political attention to the need and benefit of an integrated and global biodiversity framework.

10. Generally, participants agreed that representatives of the conventions should meet regularly and that Parties to the conventions should also have exchanges during the preparatory process.

III. PROCEEDINGS

Item 1. Opening of the workshop

11. The workshop was opened at 9 a.m. by Ambassador Franz Perrez on behalf of the Government of Switzerland. Ms. Cristiana Paşca Palmer, Executive Secretary of the Convention on Biological Diversity, Ms. Martha Rojas Urrego, Secretary General, Ramsar Convention on Wetlands, representing the Liaison Group of Biodiversity-related Conventions, and Mr. Hamdallah Zedan, representing the Presidency of the fourteenth meeting of the Conference of the Parties to the Convention on Biological Diversity, also made opening remarks. In his remarks, Ambassador Perrez confirmed the conviction of Switzerland that a well-structured governance among biodiversity-related multilateral environmental agreements allowed the harnessing of synergies and increased efficiency and impact of the strategies and action plans. As the biodiversity landscape was complex, he suggested adopting the “Spirit of Bern”: to advance slowly but steadily. Ms. Paşca Palmer recalled the invitation of the Conference of the Parties to the Convention on Biological Diversity to other multilateral environmental agreements to contribute to the preparation of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework and the intention of the Conference of the Parties to ensure coherence and complementarity of the framework with other international processes and strategies (contained in CBD decision 14/34). She stressed that the workshop was not a negotiation at which formal positions of the participating conventions would be presented. She said that the findings of recent assessments required strong actions to bring about transformational change and expressed the hope that the framework would inspire the transformational changes required to achieve the 2050 Vision of living in harmony with nature. Ms. Rojas Urrego said that the post-2020 global biodiversity framework represented a unique opportunity to approach biodiversity in a cooperative and complementary manner and to reflect the priorities and contributions of the biodiversity-related conventions. She encouraged Parties to those conventions to take an active role in the post-2020 process, to ensure a coordinated approach to their input across all relevant conventions, including through national cooperation between convention focal points. Mr. Zedan recalled that biodiversity was widely considered to be relevant only to

⁷ Under SAICM, these include a workshop on indicators of chemicals and waste in Cambridge in September 2019 and the opportunity to promote joint messaging on the two post-2020 agendas by presenting the IPBES assessment on drivers of pollution to the third meeting of the intersessional process considering SAICM and the sound management of chemicals and waste beyond 2020 to be held in Bangkok in October 2019.

Sustainable Development Goals 14 and 15, whereas it was an integral part of achieving at least nine other Goals, including those to end poverty, to end hunger, and to ensure good health. He commented that, as the biodiversity-related conventions were all implemented at the national level, it would be important to enhance cooperation at the national level and for the conventions to align their requirements for national action plans.

Item 2. Organizational matters

12. Mr. Zedan proposed Mr. Norbert Baerlocher (Switzerland) and Ms. Malta Qwathekana (South Africa, representing Parties to the Convention on the Conservation of Migratory Species of Wild Animals (CMS)) as co-Chairs of the workshop and Ms. Teona Karchava (Georgia) as Rapporteur. It was so agreed.

13. Mr. Baerlocher described the proposed organization of the workshop. He said that this would provide a setting, including small group discussions, which would enable participants to interact. For this purpose, Mr. Neville Ash, Director, United Nations Environment Programme's World Conservation Monitoring Centre (UNEP-WCMC), would serve as a facilitator. Participants agreed to the agenda and proposed organization.

Item 3. Introduction to the workshop and the process for the preparation of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework

14. Mr. Baerlocher introduced the third item of the agenda of the meeting. He invited Mr. Ash to describe how the workshop would be run.

15. Mr. Ash recalled the objectives of the workshop and gave a brief outline of its programme. Ms. Qwathekana then invited the Co-Chairs of the Open-ended Working Group on the Post-2020 Global Biodiversity Framework, Mr. Francis Ogwal of Uganda and Mr. Basile van Havre of Canada, to provide a briefing on the status of preparation of the framework.

16. Mr. Francis Ogwal⁸ and Mr. Basile van Havre provided an overview of the process for preparation of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework, including its calendar through to the fifteenth meeting of the Conference of the Parties to the CBD, a summary of views submitted on the possible content and scope of the framework ([CBD/POST2020/PREP/1/1](#)) and a summary of the outcomes of regional consultations held between January and May 2019. They said that a consistent message from the consultations was the continued relevance of the 2050 Vision for biodiversity and that its four elements of the value, conservation, wise use and restoration of biodiversity would be addressed in the Framework. Another consistent observation had been the need to address climate change and biodiversity in an integrated manner, potentially at both the national and international levels. The Framework should include a clear, simple theory of change, with fewer measurable targets and sub-targets and clear indicators. Means of implementation should be identified by the time the Framework is adopted. The Framework should also be integrated and aligned with the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development. Mr. Ogwal and Mr. van Havre then provided personal reflections on the linkages between the conventions and the relevance of these to the Framework. They had concluded that all convention activities converged on human well-being, and they provided a rationale for the linkages. Increased coordination and efficiency were likely to be part of the solution expected by Parties, non-State actors and industry. It would be important to find the right level for integration of the biodiversity-related conventions – in their mandates or actions, in implementation or in administrative arrangements – so that each could contribute to the overarching goal. Coordination of implementation mechanisms, national legislation or institutional arrangements could increase accountability, while integrated reporting would result in efficiencies for Parties.

Item 4. Consideration of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework in the context of existing global architecture

17. Under this item, the workshop participants considered the relation of a post-2020 global biodiversity framework to the frameworks and priorities of other conventions and relevant processes.

⁸ Mr. Ogwal participated by audio-link.

Background documentation on the character and status of those frameworks ([CBD/POST2020/WS/2019/6/INF/1](#)) and other relevant information were available.

18. With reference to key points made by the previous speakers, the CBD Secretariat provided a brief introduction to the global architecture of intergovernmental agreements relevant to the post-2020 global biodiversity framework, including strategies of the multilateral environmental agreements, the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011–2020, the Aichi Biodiversity Targets and 2050 Vision and the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development, including the Sustainable Development Goals and associated targets.

19. Mr. Baerlocher invited Mr. Markus Fischer to describe the work of the Intergovernmental Science-Policy Platform on Biodiversity and Ecosystem Services (IPBES), noting the great publicity generated by the findings of the Global Assessment and that IPBES could be the “glue” among the biodiversity-related conventions.

20. Mr. Fischer described nature’s contributions to people, most of which were directly related to climate change and were deteriorating worldwide, reducing people’s quality of life and threatening sustainable development. The indirect drivers of change were demographic and sociocultural, economic and technological and institutional and governmental, exacerbated by conflicts and disasters. Recognition of the knowledge, innovations, practices, institutions and values of indigenous peoples and local communities and their inclusion and participation in environmental governance enhanced their quality of life and supported nature conservation and sustainable use, which were relevant to broader society; however, indigenous and local knowledge was under pressure and decreasing in all regions. Progress towards achieving the Aichi Biodiversity Targets and the Sustainable Development Goals was poor. Progress towards the Sustainable Development Goals was being undermined by the loss of biodiversity. Analysis of the reasons showed that the most effective strategies required transformational change – fundamental, system-wide reorganization of technological, economic and social factors, including paradigms, goals and values. Although opposition could be expected from people with interests vested in the status quo, that could be overcome for the broader public good. Transformative change would require incentives and capacity-building, cross-sectoral cooperation, pre-emptive precautionary action, resilient social–ecological systems and strengthened environmental law and implementation. Eight leverage points where interventions could have large effects to achieve transformational change were identified.

21. Mr. Ash then provided a recap of key messages from previous speakers relevant to the conduct and objectives of the work that would be undertaken at the meeting, after which he invited representatives of the secretariats of the biodiversity-related and Rio conventions and other organizations to describe how their processes and priorities were related to the post-2020 global biodiversity framework.

22. The World Heritage Convention, which came into force in 1972 for the protection of cultural and natural heritage, embodied UNESCO actions for biodiversity, with links to indigenous knowledge. A total of 247 natural and mixed World Heritage sites were inscribed in the Convention. Its strategic action plan covered the decade 2012–2022. Two other important policy documents addressed the Integration of a Sustainable Development Perspective into the Processes of the World Heritage Convention and the Impacts of Climate Change on the World Heritage Properties. It was proposed that the post-2020 framework prioritize actions, serve as a common agenda for biodiversity-related conventions, include the link to culture, include concrete targets for improving conservation and demonstrate the contribution of nature to the well-being of people. Synergies between the conventions were important and would have to happen first at the national level.

23. The Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species of Wild Fauna and Flora (CITES) was described as a sustainable use convention. Due to the lack of synchronization between the cycles of the various conventions, the CITES Strategic Vision 2008–2020 had required retrofitting to the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011–2020. Its follow-up, the CITES Strategic Vision 2021–2030, with a proposed Vision Statement and five strategic goals, would be adopted at the forthcoming CITES COP 18. Cross-referencing the CITES Strategic Vision 2021–2030 and its Vision Statement in the post-2020 global biodiversity framework would ensure the inclusion of priorities agreed by CITES Parties and hence would have their ownership. The CITES Standing Committee had encouraged CITES focal points to liaise with

their CBD counterparts in the preparation of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework to ensure that the priorities of CITES were included in its development.

24. The Strategic Plan for Migratory Species 2015-2023 was complementary to the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020 and the Aichi Biodiversity Targets. In 2018, the Standing Committee of the Convention on the Conservation of Migratory Species of Wild Animals (CMS) had established a working group to contribute to the post-2020 global biodiversity framework. The working group had determined that the conservation needs of migratory species could be best represented in the future global biodiversity framework through the concept of “connectivity”, which goes beyond migratory species and the connectedness of protected areas. The new global biodiversity framework could reflect connectivity, provide a more coordinated approach for cross-cutting issues related to implementation of related conventions, such as resource mobilization and capacity-building, and provide clarity on the role of the various conventions in implementing the framework.

25. The Ramsar Convention on Wetlands, adopted in 1971, ensured the conservation and wise use of freshwater and marine and coastal wetlands and wetlands of international importance or Ramsar Sites. Its current strategic plan covered 2016–2024 and was fully aligned with the Aichi Biodiversity Targets and the Sustainable Development Goals; a mid-term review being conducted would be considered by the Conference of the Contracting Parties at its fourteenth meeting, in 2021, to enable alignment with the post-2020 global biodiversity framework. Ways to achieve a global biodiversity framework would be to ensure that it would provide: (a) a common scheme for biodiversity-related conventions and alignment with relevant Sustainable Development Goals; (b) consistency and coherence with assessments, use of relevant indicators and national reporting efforts under different conventions; (c) strengthened attention to inland waters and marine and coastal wetlands; and (d) a role for the Ramsar Convention as a lead partner for wetlands.

26. The aim of the International Plant Protection Convention (IPPC) was to protect the world’s plants from pests, which were the cause of loss of 10–16 per cent of the global harvest and 40 per cent of global food supply. The Convention was directly relevant to seven Sustainable Development Goals. A newly endorsed IPPC Strategic Framework covered the period 2020–2030, and one of its objectives was related to plant biodiversity and combating invasive alien species that are plant pests. The speaker advocated for a post-2020 global biodiversity framework that considered plant health as a key component, highlights invasive alien species that are plant pests, and that is supported by a coherent, comprehensive, innovative communication strategy to be targeted, especially to focal points.

27. The International Treaty on Plant Genetic Resources for Food and Agriculture (ITPGRFA) targeted food security and sustainable agriculture; for this goal, its objectives mirrored the three objectives of the CBD. Loss of genetic diversity made crop species very vulnerable to a major virus or climate shift, for example, and reduced options to ensure human health by limiting nutrition. Global and community seed banks had been established to avoid such effects. Its Governing Body requested the Parties and the Secretariat of the Treaty to be engaged in the process for the preparation of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework to ensure that the framework addressed and took into account the Treaty. It emphasized the importance of maintaining and strengthening targets for plant genetic resources for food and agriculture, including by relying on the monitoring of the information available through the reporting processes of the Treaty.

28. The International Whaling Commission (IWC) had been established in 1946 for the regulation of whaling and conservation of stocks. It had no overarching strategic plan, and its mandates were delivered through decisions taken by the Commission at its biennial meetings, including recommendations based on advice from its committees. Work areas relevant to the post-2020 global biodiversity framework included its Conservation Committee’s Strategic Plan 2016-2026 which established a long-term vision for healthy, well-managed and recovered cetacean populations worldwide, and identified threats and actions, including reporting. In addition, there were a series of thematic strategic plans. IWC interest in the post-2020 biodiversity framework focused on marine areas and some cross-cutting issues. IWC had no position on the post-2020 global biodiversity framework but would have an opportunity to discuss it at its meeting in September 2020 and in 2022. Areas of work that might relate to the post-2020 framework

included its work on key threats to cetaceans, relevant to biodiversity more broadly, and with key sectors. Many of its work programmes were relevant, and relevant cross-cutting areas of work included capacity-building and communications, engagement of indigenous peoples and local communities and the potential for harmonization of data management and reporting.

29. The United Nations Convention to Combat Desertification (UNCCD) had adopted a new strategic framework in 2017 for the period 2018-2030, under which teams with membership from different ministries and sectors in each country set the national targets for achieving “land degradation neutrality”. Their implementation contributed to the achievement of many Sustainable Development Goals. Based on the experience of UNCCD, the essential elements for the post-2020 global biodiversity framework were: (a) an easily communicated overarching target, supported by an implementation and monitoring framework at various levels; (b) spatially explicit targets (for species habitat, ecosystem services, connectivity) to facilitate integration of policies and programmes, investment, joint design and implementation of projects and adoption by local communities and administrations; (c) and an assessment, evaluation, monitoring and reporting approach endorsed by CBD Parties, including such indicators as land cover or extent and carbon stocks, that are applicable in other conventions and processes.

30. The representative of the secretariat of the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC) advocated that the two processes, climate and biodiversity, had a common agenda of protecting humanity from existential threats and preventing it from extinguishing its own support systems. Action within the next few years had to be transformational. There was an opportunity now to bring about the required shifts. Awareness-raising was critical. It should be kept in mind that the future world would be different from the present one because of technological advancements and other socioeconomic changes that would be brought about by the achievement of the Sustainable Development Goals. The achievement of the Sustainable Development Goals would not be enough for a sustainable world, as the problems had moved from environmental to developmental to existential.

31. SAICM had been established in 2006 with the goal of achieving sound management of chemicals throughout their life cycle by 2020. The approach was a policy framework to promote chemical safety with multisectoral stakeholders, as a complement to existing efforts. The work included capacity-building at the country and regional levels and it addressed emerging policy issues, many of which were relevant to biodiversity. It worked heavily on Sustainable Development Goal 12. It was governed by the International Conference on Chemicals Management (ICCM), comprised of governments, industry and other actors on an equal level. A process was ongoing to consider SAICM and the sound management of chemicals and waste beyond 2020. There were opportunities for the biodiversity and chemicals processes to learn from each other and perhaps build with each other. Key elements and dates in the “beyond 2020” process were presented, including the ICCM in Bonn in October 2020.

32. The Minamata Convention on Mercury, which had entered into force in August 2017, had the objective to protect human health and the environment from anthropogenic emissions and releases of mercury and mercury compounds. Artisanal and small-scale gold-mining was the largest and one of the most widespread sources of emissions, followed by coal-fired power stations. The global distribution of artisanal and small-scale gold-mining would coincide with many biodiversity hotspots. The Convention engaged diverse sectors and ministries, beyond environment, and its next meeting of the Conference of the Parties would be held in Geneva in November 2019.

33. The Basel, Rotterdam and Stockholm conventions contributed to the sound management of chemicals throughout their life cycles. In 2011, the Basel Convention had adopted a framework strategy which would be reviewed in 2021. An effectiveness evaluation of the Stockholm Convention conducted every six years had been carried out in 2017. The Stockholm Convention had a number of time-bound targets which contributed to the Sustainable Development Goals and beyond. The conventions contributed to several Sustainable Development Goals, and there was a clear link between chemicals and waste and biodiversity. An example of that link was in the area of plastic waste, which was now covered by the Basel Convention: that would have an impact on other conventions and provided an opportunity to work together. The secretariats of the three conventions had been integrated and other synergies had been

achieved through a process starting in 2006. The process for developing post-2020 global biodiversity framework might learn from the process for integration of the three conventions and could contribute to an integrated, multisectoral approach for implementation of multilateral environmental agreements, to raising awareness about the interlinkages between chemicals and wastes and biodiversity, and to increasing the political visibility of this.

34. The Institute for Sustainable Development and International Relations (IDDRI) had studied mobilization of chemical conventions to protect biodiversity. Using an example with pesticides and the Stockholm and Rotterdam conventions, four opportunities had been identified: (a) expanding the list of pesticides included in the convention annexes; (b) reinforcing institutional collaboration, for example through the Environmental Management Group; (c) enhancing non-State and multi-stakeholder cooperation between biodiversity and chemicals actors, for example through side events at respective meetings of the Conference of the Parties; and (d) building collaboration at the level of national instruments and actors.

35. The United Nations Forum on Forests is a functional commission of the Economic and Social Council. It had prepared the United Nations strategic plan for forests,⁹ which had been adopted by the General Assembly and covered the period 2017–2030,¹⁰ with a mid-term review in 2024. The plan contributed to the Sustainable Development Goals, the [Paris Agreement](#), land degradation neutrality and the Aichi Biodiversity Targets. It was implemented through voluntary national contributions. Its mission was to promote the contribution of forests and trees to the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development. There was potential to integrate the Global Forest Goals and targets in the post-2020 global biodiversity framework, to cooperate in the implementation and reporting mechanisms of the two instruments, and for collaboration among secretariats, such as in joint events and activities at large international meetings.

36. In the discussion arising from the presentations on other conventions and processes, Mr. Ash pointed out that the presenters had described how each was related to biodiversity and its post-2020 global framework. Thus, achieving the goals of one convention would affect others. Some had aligned the dates of their strategic plans with those of related targets and goals. Many had common issues and actions. Most called for transformational, not incremental, change. All showed a strong willingness to find a common agenda at the national level. Ms. Qwathekana commented that all conventions must meet human needs and livelihoods in order to be relevant, and each should establish a strong business case with that end in mind. Other participants commented that all the conventions should also emphasize benefit-sharing and identify responsibilities. The importance of harnessing the synergies in the biodiversity-related conventions should be recognized by their executive secretaries, who should make countries aware of the opportunities to meet their commitments under the Sustainable Development Goals and their national biodiversity strategies and action plans through synergistic approaches to implementation. Connections among conventions should start from the top, whereby the governing body ensured convergence, a common minimal agenda and both short- and long-term plans. The vision of each convention might need to be adjusted to ensure alignment.

37. Other participants commented that government actions that were attempting to improve the economies of their countries should not be branded as “enemies” but should rather be engaged as “allies”. Conservation of biodiversity had hitherto been addressed project by project, but a long-term view was needed. Messages should be targeted specifically for national focal points; others should be designed to raise awareness and emphasize human rights and lives, showing what people could do individually to advance achievement of the Sustainable Development Goals. As transformational change was unusual, there would have to be an overwhelming public mandate. The conventions should have a common communication strategy in order to change the dynamic within countries, so that not only biodiversity-related conventions but also the business community talked about biodiversity. The unified agenda of the comprehensive, inclusive global framework should be work towards a sustainable environment, with good mechanisms for implementation.

⁹ See [E/2017/10–E/CN.18/SS/2017/2](#).

¹⁰ See General Assembly resolution [71/285](#) of 27 April 2017.

38. The mandates, implementation tools and organization of each convention should be simplified, filtered and prioritized to address the most urgent needs, such as increasing political will, identifying possible actions and synergies and prioritizing simple actions. National focal points should be well versed in the post-2020 global biodiversity framework and inform their government counterparts. Focal points were a vital link, and governments should review them to ensure that they were effective.
39. One participant commented that loss of biodiversity in combination with climate change altered the adaptability of species and how plants were grown and traded. Policies should therefore include plant health. To protect biodiversity, all forces should be combined, including rural communities. The experiences of the different conventions should be shared to identify similarities and resolve differences.
40. Another commented that national reports on the Sustainable Development Goal agenda were weak and therefore did not provide the evidence necessary to communicate and obtain political support for crucial elements of sustainable development. Another recalled that between 2000 and 2002, UNEP had called for harmonization of biodiversity reporting, and he suggested that the initiative be revisited.
41. The communication strategy should emphasize intergenerational justice and the responsibility for future generations in a rights-based approach. Furthermore, young people should take part in decision-making, as it was they who would suffer the consequences.
42. One participant cited the United Nations Decade on Ecosystem Restoration (2021–2030), which could be a basis for building synergies among the different conventions. As negative messaging had not convinced people to change, they might rally around ecosystem restoration and sustainable use, to which all conventions could contribute. If a common post-2020 agenda could be agreed upon, each convention could assume the leadership of one or more issues. The agenda should be framed with new techniques in order to be more aggressive so that it would be taken into account by policymakers. Risk management approaches to national disaster response could be used, which would attract the attention of government ministries, such as those responsible for budgets and planning. Both awareness and ownership should be created to engage people in biodiversity-related activities and help them see that productive business was not sustainable. A risk-based approach should apply at landscape level, where the interests of all the conventions on sustainable development came together.
43. One participant said that common areas of the conventions could be built on. Both the positive and negative effects of implementation measures for each should be identified, as some had unintended consequences, such as loss of biodiversity due to planting of trees, and protection of species and spaces could lead to conflicts between species and humans and government and business.
44. The work of IPBES showed areas of failure and of success. The strategic framework should be addressed not to those working in biodiversity but to the wider public and the productive sectors that were users of biodiversity and ecosystems, as it was they who would have to make the transformative changes. Sustainable development was universal, for all countries, to ensure the absence of hunger and health and welfare.
45. Other agencies, such as Interpol, should be involved, for instance in cases of dumping of wastes.
46. The co-chairs, summing up the discussion,¹¹ noted a general acceptance of a common responsibility for stopping loss of biodiversity, a need to strengthen the implementation of the biodiversity-related multilateral environmental agreements and a general willingness to coordinate the different processes. They had shown respect for the role of other conventions in common priorities and also for changing attitudes and practices, such as alignment in implementation and reporting to avoid duplication. They had noted a wide spectrum of engagement, responsibilities, duties and activities, with understanding of the areas of competence of colleagues in other conventions. It was suggested that representatives of the conventions should meet regularly and that Parties to the conventions also have exchanges. The discussion had shown enormous enthusiasm for a stronger future. The post-2020 global biodiversity framework should ensure that the different conventions could work together more efficiently.

¹¹ The reflections of the co-chairs on the discussion were provided upon opening the second day of the meeting.

Item 5. Identification of elements that could be included in the post-2020 global biodiversity framework

47. The facilitator asked the representatives of the conventions, treaties and organizations present at the meeting to form groups to have preliminary discussions about the issues that they considered should be highlighted in the post-2020 global biodiversity framework. They would report back on the last day of the meeting.

48. After these groups had finished their initial discussions, Mr. Ash said that eight “stations” would be set up on the second day of the meeting, at which successive groups of participants would identify elements to be included in the post-2020 global biodiversity framework. Participants would be assigned to groups so that each was diverse and balanced, and the discussions at each station would be facilitated by the same moderator and note-taker, using a consistent set of questions for each group. The topics addressed at the eight stations were:

Station 1: Targets and objectives for keeping healthy terrestrial ecosystems and their vital contribution to people;

Station 2: Measures to address direct and indirect drivers of biodiversity loss and mainstreaming biodiversity into society;

Station 3: Targets and objectives for maintaining healthy marine ecosystems and their vital contribution to people;

Station 4: Implementation framework: resource mobilization, capacity-building, technical and scientific cooperation and communication;

Station 5: Objectives and measures for reducing the rate of extinction of species and their vital contribution to people;

Station 6: Addressing shared objectives: gender equality, women’s empowerment and social inclusion, indigenous peoples and local communities and human rights;

Station 7: Objectives and measures for safeguarding genetic resources and their equitable use;

Station 8: Accountability framework: monitoring, assessment, reporting and review.

49. Prior to the discussions at the eight stations, Mr. Ash invited two short presentations on information and tools available related to cooperation among conventions and relevant to a global biodiversity framework. These were particularly relevant to the themes of discussion at stations 4 and 8, but also to others. Ms. Katharina Bieberstein of UNEP-WCMC presented information on various resources relevant to the contribution of other multilateral environmental agreements to the post-2020 global biodiversity framework, including work on indicators, national reporting and mechanisms to support cooperation. They had been compiled in a supporting document for the workshop¹² and further information related to national reporting was provided in another document.¹³ Mr. Eric Wiedmer, NatureConsult, Switzerland, presented the data reporting tool for multilateral environment agreements, DART, developed by UNEP-InforMEA, which allowed sharing and multiple use of data, thus reducing the burden of reporting to many different conventions.

50. At the conclusion of the discussions at the eight stations, Mr. Ash asked participants to submit up to three suggestions of topics for further discussion. Those suggestions would inform the choice of topics for discussion on the third day of the meeting.

51. In opening the third day of the meeting, the co-Chairs, who had sat in on each of the groups, commented that most had addressed the reasons for not meeting targets, including for mainstreaming biodiversity, ensuring the rights of vulnerable groups and conservation of species. Ms. Qwathekana commented that diversity was essential not only for species but also for populations and genes.

¹² [CBD/POST2020/WS/2019/6/INF/2](#).

¹³ [CBD/POST2020/WS/2019/6/INF/3](#).

Furthermore, the use and conservation of genetic resources had to include access and benefit-sharing, and she asked whether the existing targets related to the Nagoya Protocol should be modified for the post-2020 framework, including digital sequence information. Mr. Baerlocher commented on the difficulty of defining clear, simple targets for the framework that did not contradict or exclude any process.

52. Mr. Ash then invited the facilitators at the eight stations to summarize the discussions.

53. At station 1, on terrestrial ecosystems, participants considered that freshwater ecosystems should be included in that term and should be given prominent attention in the post-2020 global biodiversity framework, as they had higher rates of degradation and were excellent ecological integrators. Soil should also be targeted as an integrating element for broader actions, including water retention in landscapes and productivity. There had been little controversy about area-based targets, although participants considered that additional, more qualitative, dimensions needed to be emphasized in the post-2020 biodiversity framework: connectivity, intactness, management capacity and effectiveness. In addition to protected areas, the framework should reflect other effective area-based conservation measures (OECMs), including stewardship by indigenous peoples and local communities. Resilience of ecosystems to climate change was also important. Trade-offs between different land uses should be recognized. The relevance of spatial planning and of environmental impact assessments (EIA) and strategic environmental assessments (SEA), such as those of the environmental and social safeguard policies of the World Bank, were also identified. All direct and indirect drivers of terrestrial and freshwater degradation should be addressed, as identified in the IPBES *Global Assessment* report and the relevant Aichi Biodiversity Targets. Consideration should be given as to whether it would be best to address indirect drivers and underlying causes directly through targets or to have action-related targets to address them. For example, instead of a general target on subsidies there could be SMART targets on specific sectors. Existing processes and targets that could be reflected in the framework were identified. Among others, these included Sustainable Development Goal targets 14.2 and 15.1 to 15.4; goals related to freshwater ecosystems (Ramsar strategic plan 2016-2024, Sustainable Development Goal target 6.6 and its indicator 6.6.1); Global Forest Goal 1 of the United Nations strategic plan for forests; and trade-related goals on e-commerce (IPPC) and illegal wildlife products (CITES and Sustainable Development Goal target 15.7). A question was raised about whether lifestyle factors, such as diet, should be addressed through links with the Sustainable Development Goals.

54. Participants at station 2 had discussed measures to address direct and indirect drivers of biodiversity loss and mainstreaming biodiversity into society. The method used for mainstreaming depended on whether it was done nationally, regionally or internationally; local people should be involved meaningfully at every level. In general, it was considered that the term mainstreaming should be better defined in order to raise public awareness. Some thought that it should be seen not as a target but as a means to achieving targets, while others considered that it should be a dedicated goal. Both direct and indirect drivers should be included in the post-2020 global biodiversity framework. Many good indicators were already included in the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development. Furthermore, the 2030 Agenda provided a working method, as Governments and stakeholders had set up systems to meet the goals, with connections to local level. The multilateral environmental agreements already had goals and targets with regard to mainstreaming. The goals stated in the framework must be easy to understand by all sectors in order to inspire cooperation, including with the private sector and young people. Means must be found to include scientific information, as the environmental element might be lost if the goals were too broad. Direct drivers should be associated with targets, while the indirect drivers should be used as means to achieve targets. Participants had also proposed the need for a supplementary implementation framework.

55. At station 3, participants noted that coastal and marine ecosystems were affected by human activities on both the land and the sea, although the two were often considered separately. Furthermore, biodiversity in both salt and freshwater was critical for food security, as land systems became insufficient to feed people. Biodiversity must be clearly defined, with its links to human activities but reflecting nature's needs as a defensible priority. Links should also be made with the status of nature and the environment, including the value of reef systems. Ownership by people should be recognized by both regional organizations and local processes, with strong engagement along all value chains, including businesses. The IPBES model neatly identified indirect and direct drivers, and different processes decided

which they addressed, with links to existing frameworks. All the multilateral environmental agreements were integral parts of the model, and other regional fisheries management organizations should participate in such meetings. The entire United Nations family should be drawn in by giving them responsibilities, promoting partnerships and cross-fertilization. Although the targets would be overarching, commitments could be made at a lower scale, with drivers as the main thematic programmes, with different targets and commitments. Addressing the biodiversity of areas beyond national jurisdiction would also be relevant.

56. Discussants at station 4 addressed the implementation framework, which would be fundamental to the delivery of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework. They considered that enabling activities could be part of a supplementary framework. Responsibilities for different actions and cooperation and synergies should be defined so that conventions as well as United Nations agencies could work together within the implementation framework to support countries, while focal points worked together nationally. Better means should be found to understand and track activities. Resource mobilization could promote cooperation among conventions, with better linkages among agendas through multipurpose activities beneficial to multiple conventions, including capacity-building and technical cooperation that evolved with the changing situation. Resources should be redirected, to ensure better financing for measures undertaken by indigenous people and local communities. Joint projects could be prepared and implemented. Finance mechanisms, such as the Global Environment Fund and the Green Climate Fund, could work with multiple conventions. Capacity-building would be especially important for national focal points. Joint communication should ensure the delivery of consistent, harmonized messages, which could build on IPBES findings and link biodiversity to people's lives, for example through common elements, such as water. The secretariats of the different processes should learn to work together, as many programmes of work were cross-cutting. The post-2020 global biodiversity framework provided an opportunity to build commitment and increase the pressure to act.

57. At station 5, on measures to reduce the rate of extinction of species, discussions addressed various species-related aspects, including whether the existing targets should be taken forward into the next decade. The iconic Aichi Biodiversity Target 12 was linked to connectivity and drivers, as it was not species that should be targeted but rather the drivers of extinction, such as agriculture. Synergies should be found among the multilateral environmental agreements and the custodian agencies of the Sustainable Development Goals targets, who also worked on the indicators. "Extinction" was a dramatic target, and discussants considered that maintaining and restoring the population sizes and numbers of existing species would be a preferable goal. Emblematic or indicator species could be prioritized, although essential species such as plankton must be included. All conservation action plans should be covered in the post-2020 global biodiversity framework after analysis of the complementarity of the plans, indicators and targets. Activities should extend beyond protected areas and include transboundary issues. Monitoring under CITES, CMS and Ramsar should be emphasized, and data could be extended by use of satellites and artificial intelligence. Common monitoring would avoid duplication of data among conventions. The long-term drivers of species loss included unsustainable use, climate change, increasing populations, invasive alien species, overexploitation, pollution and use of pesticides. Values and mindsets about species must be changed. Benefit-sharing, rights and land tenure for indigenous peoples and local communities should be ensured by increasing political will, sectoral management (such as fisheries) and law enforcement (such as customs, instruments and measures, demand reduction and illegal and unregulated trade). The private sector should be better controlled by legislation and restrictions on trade. Aichi Biodiversity Target 12 was still relevant and could be linked to others with more indicators.

58. At station 6, participants discussed whether gender equality, social inclusion, indigenous peoples and local communities and human rights should be considered targets in their own right or as a cross-cutting part of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework. The IPBES *Global Assessment* report covered all four issues as well as that of reducing inequalities. Some said that singling out gender equality might take attention away from biodiversity, as the links were not clear. It could be stated as an overarching principle, which was therefore not mentioned under each topic, although that might mean it was ignored. Youth should also be included, with a statement of the advantages for conservation, sustainable use and access and benefit-sharing. An improvement on Aichi Biodiversity Target 14 should

be sought. National engagement was essential. Existing goals, targets and indicators included the Sustainable Development Goals, the Beijing Platform for Action¹⁴ and various other resolutions which showed that women, youth and rural populations were important agents of change. The target of stakeholder engagement would be empowering women in local communities to ensure their full participation as custodians of knowledge about their environment. A human rights-based approach should be used to ensure access to land, water, clean air and fisheries, with public access to information. The existing frameworks included the preamble to the Nagoya Protocol, the Framework Principles on Human Rights and the Environment¹⁵ and the principle of the Sustainable Development Goals of leaving no one behind.

59. At station 7, on genetic diversity, the various groups noted that the term “genetic diversity” was preferable to “genetic resources” as it reflected both conservation and use. The post-2020 global biodiversity framework should reflect the objectives and work of the various conventions and treaties, which included the conservation, sustainable use and equitable sharing of the benefits derived from genetic diversity and resources, which also reflect nutrition, food security, consumption patterns and the links between nature, food consumption and ecosystem resilience. Common, shared responsibility for genetic diversity at the global, national and local levels should be recognized. Conservation should include wild relatives, with explicit reference to sustainable use and equitable sharing. The concept of ecological interconnectivity at national and transnational levels should be included for protected areas, land restoration and pollinators. Barriers to the sustainable use of genetic diversity, including at subspecies level, include lack of adequate national legislation. Management of intellectual property rights may also affect use of genetic diversity and innovation, and research, documentation, characterization and evaluation should be improved. Other issues that erode genetic diversity are the introduction of alien species, overexploitation, uniform crops and climate change, which reduce the resilience of ecosystems. General awareness of the importance of genetic diversity for human life is required to obtain wider political support, and education is critical to increase the involvement of civil society, the private sector and other stakeholders. Links should be made to the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development and Sustainable Development Goal targets 2.5 and 15.6; genetic diversity and their resources contribute indirectly to Sustainable Development Goals 1, 2, 3, 12, 13, 14 and 17. Target 9 of the Global Strategy for Plant Conservation and Sustainable Development Goal 2.5 could be used as a target in the Framework, and Aichi Biodiversity Targets 12, 13 and 16 are relevant. The indicators of genetic diversity of FAO, ITPGRFA, CBD and other organizations should be harmonized, and efforts should be made to avoid duplication in reporting and to harmonize it through such initiatives as modular reporting. The rights of indigenous people and cultural and farmers’ rights should be better recognized and respected.

60. One participant commented that the link to food security should be considered as a separate issue.

61. Station 8 addressed accountability frameworks. Participants commented that strengthening national reporting should include clearer targets and indicators, and conventions and other processes could audit the inclusiveness of implementation and reporting and improve their reporting templates. Nationally, capacity-building should be provided, with public discussion of the role and process of reporting, which would strengthen the role of national reports. Reports could also be reviewed regularly by peers. With regard to integration of reporting among conventions, modular reporting could be used, based on the DART tool. There had been no shared view on how the process should be designed or on the legal implications of cross-referencing the reports of other processes. Other mechanisms to increase political accountability might include a dedicated compliance committee under CBD and a common compliance mechanism among the conventions. Views opposing that suggestion were expressed, as it was considered that it could be detrimental. Mechanisms and approaches under other processes that could be learned from were described and included the Talanoa Dialogue under UNFCCC with the involvement of non-Party stakeholders in discussions with Parties on enhancement and implementation of nationally determined contributions, and third-party reporting under CMS and the United Nations Human Rights

¹⁴ See *Report of the Fourth World Conference on Women*, Beijing, 4-15 September 1995 ([A/CONF.177/20/Rev.1](#)), United Nations publication, Sales No. 96.IV.13, chap. I.

¹⁵ [A/HRC/37/59](#), annex.

Council. Use of information derived by satellite for review of implementation was also discussed. Complementing the review process with the review of actions by actors other than Parties was also considered. The potential for the Sharm El-Sheikh to Kunming Action Agenda launched at the fourteenth meeting of the Conference of the Parties to the Convention on Biological Diversity to complement reports on review of progress by other actors was noted. One concrete suggestion was for a common framework for national commitments and action, so that commitments under other instruments could be unified.

62. Commenting on the summary of the discussions, one participant said that accountability must be linked with resource mobilization and capacity-building in order to hold Parties accountable. Another comment was that streamlined reporting must ensure the quality and comparability of data by use of methods consistent with the Sustainable Development Goals. The speaker recalled that DART simply provided a space to gather data for reporting. It was not an additional reporting tool but would help Parties to produce the reports for the different agreements. A participant said that another tool had been developed for automating and aggregating some indicators for the IUCN Red List. Another speaker reminded participants that, although the reporting processes of different conventions provided opportunities for integration, the usefulness of each system for its convention should be recognized. Furthermore, conventions were the custodian agencies of some Sustainable Development Goal indicators.

63. At the conclusion of the reports on discussions at the eight stations, Mr. Ash informed participants that more than 100 proposals of topics for further discussion had been received, four of which were mentioned 10 or more times: (a) the role of multilateral environmental agreements in driving transformational change to the 2020 Vision; (b) sustainable use, trade and the multiple values of biodiversity; (c) accountability, including monitoring, indicators, reporting and review metrics; and (d) tangible ways in which the multilateral environmental agreements could contribute to the preparation of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework, with actions and timeframes over the coming 15 months. Four groups were formed to discuss those topics.

64. Mr. Ash invited a member of each of the four groups to summarize the discussions.

65. The group that discussed the role of multilateral environmental agreements in driving transformational change to the 2020 Vision said that collective work must be done on the same message and that discussions should go beyond the agreements to the wider United Nations, Governments and the private sector. Joint actions could include: (a) a joint statement during high-level events, such as the High-level Political Forum on Sustainable Development; (b) internal briefings for focal points on joint actions and options for coordination to meet the IPBES recommendations on transformational change; (c) work among the agreements to flesh out detailed actions; (d) a call for the United Nations special rapporteur on human rights on the links between nature and sustainable development; and (e) voluntary contributions from Parties to build momentum. Transformational change should lead to a common vision of living in harmony with nature by 2050, with actual targets, to be defined. The current GDP-based model of economic growth should be revised to ensure that nature was more valued and incorporated into government and private sector decision-making, emphasizing human rights, equality and environmental justice as means of tackling the drivers of environmental degradation, such as vested interests that result in power imbalance and undermine local voices, traditional knowledge and the ability to conserve nature, with recognition of indigenous peoples and local communities as the custodians or stewards of nature and the wider benefits to society. To catalyse transformational change, the post-2020 global biodiversity framework should be based on coordination with wider international processes, an all-of-government approach, involvement of the private sector and integration with the Sustainable Development Goals.

66. The group that discussed sustainable use and multiple values of biodiversity in the post-2020 global biodiversity framework said that sustainable use of biological resources and ecosystems were poorly communicated, as compared with species loss. Ecosystem frameworks should focus on understanding of effective reporting, such as how fish stocks also affect the human environment. With regard to the multiple values of biodiversity, studies could address the pressures at different levels and how they reduced the value for people and structures up to ecosystems. Evaluation frameworks should be devised, with integration of indicators of how they affected the environment. Wealthy countries that respected biodiversity nationally should recognize that they sometimes caused degradation beyond their

boundaries and the overall scale of their impact. Although it was Parties that reported to CBD, species could often be managed only by groups at local levels. Therefore, the boundaries of reporting should be considered. Ecosystem services had different formats, requiring different technical reports and toolkits, making integrated reporting difficult. To ensure food security for a growing population, without increasing the pressure on ecosystems, CBD should actively engage with business and be seen as a positive venue for discussing biodiversity. Another aspect was the inclusion of cultural values in discussions on ecosystems and not just the monetary aspect. Generational equity was a further issue. Trade- and nature-based solutions were required, with the inclusion of new technologies and sustainable value chain approaches into business practices.

67. The group that discussed accountability, monitoring and review concluded that the basis for the new post-2020 global biodiversity framework should be countries commitments, based on impacts and drivers of biodiversity loss. Possible components were reporting of information to enhance coordination among focal points and a component to account for direct and indirect compliance, with incentives and rankings. A verification component would ensure that all the necessary information was available, with reports from different sectors to government level. Periodic, independent reviews could be conducted. Enabling components would be capacity-building and resource mobilization, while the visibility component would consist of public access. The main challenges would be in the reporting and verification aspects.

68. The fourth group discussed ways in which the multilateral environmental agreements could contribute to the preparation of the global framework, with actions and timeframes over the coming 15 months. This is reported under agenda item 6.

69. Mr. Ash then asked the representatives of the groups of conventions and organizations to report back from their discussions on issues to be highlighted in the post-2020 global biodiversity framework.

70. A group consisting of representatives of the chemicals conventions and CBD had identified three areas for collaboration in the post-2020 framework: targets and indicators, communications and messaging and linked scientific activities. The first would consist of identifying areas for interlinkage and possible joint targets or indicators, and it was proposed that a biodiversity indicators expert be invited to participate in a workshop on indicators of chemicals and waste in Cambridge in September 2019. Joint messages on the post-2020 agendas could be ensured by presenting the IPBES assessment on drivers of pollution to the SAICM intersessional process at its meeting in Bangkok in October 2019. Joint activities could be organized on the emerging risks for biodiversity associated with pesticides, persistent organic pollutants, mercury, pharmaceuticals and plastic waste.

71. The significance of the World Heritage Convention (WHC) was reemphasized both for nature conservation and for the intersection it provided with the cultural sector. Its strong compliance mechanisms could be considered in the implementation of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework at the national level. World Heritage Sites demonstrated the positive role of conserving nature for communities. The importance for the national focal points responsible for Party inputs to the post-2020 process to reach out to the focal points of WHC was emphasized.

72. The simple, overarching message of CITES applied to multilateral environmental agreements, indicating the role and contribution of each player. Actions were based on threats or direct drivers that were evident to everyone and could therefore be used as clear, measurable targets. Any integration of the work of such agreements could be based on voluntary pledges in a partnership of equals.

73. A group that included CMS and IWC emphasized the importance of connectivity for both conservation and sustainable use, with mainstreaming into the private sector, government, cities and elsewhere. The CMS working group on the post-2020 global biodiversity framework envisaged international cooperation on implementation. Better communication was needed to show that biodiversity provided benefits. A risk management and disaster reduction approach was proposed, as loss of biodiversity in the global landscape was not a condition that could be remedied.

74. A spokesperson for Ramsar called for greater emphasis on wetlands in the new framework, as had been stated throughout the workshop. This included both inland and coastal wetlands, which had been largely overlooked in the Aichi Biodiversity Targets, and wetlands as an element of an ecosystem-based approach of the new framework. Ramsar had extensive knowledge and data relevant to the post-2020 global biodiversity framework from its work both within and outside protected areas. Use could be made in the post-2020 framework of relevant Sustainable Development Goal indicators, for some of which the conventions were custodians or co-custodians and provided data from national reports.

75. A representative of IPPC said that IPPC addressed the specific issue in the biodiversity agenda of invasive alien species, plants or pests of plants, by ensuring legal requirements for countries. For example, regulations on packaging prevented transport of contaminating species on machinery and other equipment. That work could complement the work of CBD through standards set as a basis for international trade. He further proposed joint work on communication and capacity-building to emphasize prevention. He noted that no representatives of business had attended the workshop, whereas it would be important to ensure their cooperation. Next year would be the international year of plant health, and he hoped that the biodiversity community would join in the activities. The newly endorsed IPPC strategic framework that would be formally adopted in April 2020 was based on an analysis of how the previous framework had failed, and he proposed that others analyse why certain biodiversity targets had not been reached.

76. The facilitator said that a business consultation was planned.

77. The ITPGRFA worked on increasing the involvement of the agricultural sector in ensuring food security through sustainable use and conservation. It would be important to recognize the importance of resilience and robustness, which were embedded in genetic diversity. He said it would be important to consider how the post-2020 global biodiversity framework would recognize the work of other conventions, such as on the rights and involvement of farmers and the traditional knowledge of indigenous peoples and local communities. Safe agricultural practices were an essential element of food security. The speaker recalled the seminal work of the FAO Commission on Genetic Resources for Food and Agriculture on targets and indicators as relevant to the post-2020 global biodiversity framework.

78. A representative of UNCCD stressed that each convention should maintain its legal independence. The strategic objectives of UNCCD correlated closely with Aichi Biodiversity Targets and elements of its strategic framework would be relevant to the post-2020 global biodiversity framework. The relevance of Sustainable Development Goal indicators was noted.

Item 6. Identification of ways in which other conventions can further contribute to the preparation of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework

79. The group that discussed the contributions of multilateral environmental agreements to the preparation of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework said that the timing of the governing bodies of the different processes would have a bearing on the provision of the views of the multilateral environmental agreements. Parties from the various multilateral environmental agreements would not necessarily have any mandate to present views if those bodies had not met. Several of the multilateral environmental agreements would be having meetings of their governing bodies or standing committees in the coming months. The IUCN World Conservation Congress in June 2020 would provide another important platform for discussion. It was essential that the views expressed were developed nationally, within governments. A draft structure of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework would be available six weeks before the meeting of the Open-ended Working Group that was to be held in August, to allow conventions to prepare input which could continue at its subsequent meetings. CBD focal points could seek the views of the focal points to other conventions to coordinate input. Representatives of the multilateral environmental agreements could meet in the margins of the meeting of the Open-ended Working Group. It was also suggested that the Liaison Group of Biodiversity-related Conventions should hold a meeting focused on the post-2020 global biodiversity framework as soon as possible and that the Environment Management Group of the United Nations could also play an important role in supporting the preparation and implementation of the framework. One question was how the discussion should be framed to ensure that it was politically important. The IPBES report provided an opportunity for the

present group to find ways to address findings. The eight biodiversity-related conventions could use their collective expertise and resources to address the IPBES findings in such a way as to stimulate Parties to action. For the new framework to most effectively reflect the strengths and contribution of all biodiversity-related conventions, further consultations among the conventions, as a “partnership of equals”, would be held to identify how the various convention priorities could be reflected in the framework, how the various conventions could work more coherently together in shaping and implementing the framework, and how the various conventions could more effectively collaborate in addressing the IPBES findings and the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development. A common communication strategy was required for all the agreements. All mechanisms and meetings should be used to exploit synergies among the conventions. The group identified four questions that warranted further attention and discussion: (a) the relation of the different bodies of the conventions to the post-2020 global biodiversity framework; (b) the relation of the new framework to the United Nations General Assembly; (c) the role of each Convention in implementing the post-2020 framework; and (d) the necessary governance for the cross-cutting global framework. The opportunity provided by the post-2020 framework to address the biodiversity crisis was emphasized.

80. In the discussion that followed, the presentations from the various groups, the role of the Environmental Management Group of the United Nations was identified as important for providing advice and ownership from among United Nations entities. Another important body was the Liaison Group of Biodiversity-related Conventions. Both could ensure interagency coordination on the environment with the conventions. One speaker recalled that the Environmental Management Group had been asked to map the contributions of United Nations entities to the Aichi Biodiversity Targets for the eleventh meeting of the Conference of the Parties. It could again involve the United Nations entities along with the multilateral environmental agreements in design, implementation and reporting through indicators.

81. With regard to governance, each process required a mandate to take initiatives, and the speaker suggested that Switzerland, with its expertise in facilitating dialogue, could bring together the presidencies of the COPs of all the agreements informally to discuss governance of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework. Another speaker said that governance was complex, and discussions on that aspect might distract from the substance of a framework to which all conventions could relate. The focal points of the different processes should be in contact and be viewed as an added value.

82. Mr. Ash suggested that participants could inform their national focal points about the outcome of the current meeting. A representative of IPCC recalled that many conventions were underfunded and found difficulty in conducting even their core activities. They would therefore have to show how their daily work would benefit from such activities as capacity-building, mapping and communication. One participant suggested that some States Parties should serve as champions for the integrated approach to demonstrate its usefulness.

83. Mr. Baerlocher invited participants to convey any additional points that they considered important for the next steps ahead.

84. One speaker reiterated that there was a need to include trade-related bodies to assist in the process owing to their relevance, for example, in relation to addressing invasive alien species.

85. One speaker emphasized the importance for the national focal points responsible for Party inputs to the post-2020 process to reach out to the focal points of WHC.

86. Another speaker stressed the primordial importance for the post-2020 global biodiversity framework to facilitate effectiveness in implementation at the national level and common ownership by multilateral environmental agreements at the national level and, therefore, that the various multilateral environmental agreements should be engaged in the preparatory process leading up to 2020 at the national level. She gave the example of the steps being taken by her country for a national consultative process.

87. Another speaker highlighted the importance of outreach regarding the IPBES *Global Assessment* to make it widely available as the multilateral environmental agreements began to think of that equal partnership that would respond to the findings of the report.

88. Mr. Baerlocher recalled the synergy process under CBD,¹⁶ tools to enhance coordination and the availability of the UNEP Sourcebook with a great deal of advice on strengthening coordination at the national level.

89. In the concluding discussions, one participant said that, when considering options for follow-up to the current workshop, it would be important for all countries to have the opportunity to participate in relevant discussions.

Item 7. Other matters

90. No other matters were raised.

Item 8. Consideration of the draft report

91. Ms. Karchava said that the draft report of the meeting would be shared with the participants in approximately two weeks' time for comments, following which it would be finalized and published in good time prior to the first meeting of the Open-ended Working Group on the Post-2020 Global Biodiversity Framework.

Item 9. Closure of the workshop

92. Mr. Baerlocher informed participants that he and his co-chair were considering preparing a paper that would summarize their own reflections on the workshop and ideas for attaining its goal for a global framework for all conventions whose work related to biodiversity.

93. Mr. Baerlocher invited Mr. van Havre, on behalf of the Co-Chairs of the Open-ended Working Group on the Post-2020 Global Biodiversity Framework, Mr. Zedan, representing the Presidency of the fourteenth meeting of the Conference of the Parties to the Convention on Biological Diversity, Mr. Kent Nnadozie, Secretary of ITPGRFA, representing the Liaison Group of Biodiversity-related Conventions, and Ms. Jyoti Mathur-Filipp, on behalf of the Executive Secretary of CBD, to make some concluding remarks.

94. In his remarks, Mr. van Havre noted the clear willingness demonstrated by participants to work together in the preparatory process of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework. He saw a clear need for coordinated action across the various instruments that relate to nature, and a possible need for mechanisms to support that. Coordination in addressing enabling factors, such as resource mobilization, could also be beneficial. He looked forward to further opportunities to work on those issues in more detail. In his remarks, Mr. Zedan said that he saw two issues featured prominently in the discussions that would require more discussion: respectively, the mechanisms for implementation and for accountability. In his remarks, Mr. Nnadozie said that the post-2020 framework provided a great opportunity to facilitate and realize synergies in the implementation of the related conventions. He gave particular thanks to the representatives of the bureaux and committees of the conventions, which was a testimony of the willingness of the conventions to engage in the process, and noted that the meeting served as a starting point to be built upon. In her remarks, Ms. Mathur-Filipp gave thanks to the participants and all those who had contributed to the meeting, including to the City of Bern for the reception held on 11 June 2019.

95. Mr. Baerlocher provided some concluding reflections. He likened the conventions to a family of equals whose members had their own independence, activities and agendas, and the meeting to a family reunion that had enabled an understanding of their different priorities and areas where they could support one another in their shared ambition to stop the loss of biodiversity. The new post-2020 global biodiversity framework, of common ownership would enable cooperation between the multilateral environmental agreements in areas that support implementation both of their own objectives and those of the new common framework. To succeed in their shared ambition, there was also a need to strengthen coordination. Further thought would be required to achieve a strategic approach to enhancing synergies, shared by each of the governing processes. Four participants provided additional comments or sought clarification concerning elements of the next steps.

96. Following those reflections, the workshop closed at 6 p.m. on Wednesday 12 June 2019.

¹⁶ The synergies process under CBD includes Conference of the Parties decision XIII/24 which, among other things, contains relevant options for enhancing synergies among the biodiversity-related conventions at the national level.
