



Convention on Biological Diversity

Distr.
GENERAL

CBD/POST2020/PREP/1/INF/1
24 January 2019

ORIGINAL: ENGLISH

PREPARATIONS FOR THE POST-2020 BIODIVERSITY FRAMEWORK

SYNTHESIS OF VIEWS OF PARTIES AND OBSERVERS ON THE SCOPE AND CONTENT OF THE POST-2020 GLOBAL BIODIVERSITY FRAMEWORK

1. The Conference of the Parties at its fifteenth meeting, in 2020, is expected to consider for adoption the post-2020 global biodiversity framework, which will be developed through a preparatory process agreed during the fourteenth meeting of the Conference of the Parties.¹
2. On several occasions,² Parties and observers have been invited to submit views on the process for developing the post-2020 global biodiversity framework. A number of Parties and observers used these invitations to also provide views on the structure and content of the framework. A summary of these views was made available to the Subsidiary Body on Implementation at its second meeting.³
3. At its second meeting, the Subsidiary Body on Implementation requested the Executive Secretary to invite, for submission by 15 December 2018, initial views on the aspects of the scope and content of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework, including (a) the scientific underpinning of the scale and scope of actions necessary to make progress towards the 2050 Vision and (b) a possible structure. The present document is a synthesis of the comments received by 15 January 2019.⁴

¹ Decision 14/34.

² See notifications [2017-052](#) and [2017-124](#).

³ CBD/SBI/2/17, annex II.

⁴ 96 submissions were received by 15 January 2019. Some submissions were joint submissions from several Parties and organizations and some Parties and organizations provided more than one submission. Comments were received from: Australia, Brazil, Canada, China, Colombia, Costa Rica, European Union and its member states, Iceland, Israel, Japan, Mexico, New Zealand, Norway, Switzerland, Uganda, the United States of America, 4th Science Forum, Aichi Prefecture, Asia Indigenous Peoples Pact, Australian Rainforest Conservation Society, Avaaz, Biodiversify, Bioversity International, BirdLife International, Cambridge Conservation Initiative, Campaign for Nature, CDC Biodiversité, CEEweb for Biodiversity, Center for Large Landscape Conservation, Centres of Distinction on ILK, Children & Nature Network, China Biodiversity Conservation and Green Development Foundation, China Council for International Cooperation on Environment and Development, Consejo Indígena de Mesoamérica, Conservation International, Convention on the Conservation of Migratory Species and its Agreements, Coordinadora de Organizaciones Indígenas de la Cuenca Amazónica, EcoNexus, Emmaus Aurinkotehdas ry, Fauna & Flora International, Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations, Forest Peoples Programme, Foro Indígena de Abya Yala, Fridtjof Nansen Institute, Friends of the Earth International, Fundación Ambiente y Recursos Naturales, Future Earth, Global Forest Coalition, Global Partnership for Business and Biodiversity, Global Partnership for Plant Conservation, Global Wildlife Conservation, Global Youth Biodiversity Network, Green Economy Coalition, Green Growth Knowledge Platform and its Natural Capital Expert Working Group, Greenpeace, Group on Earth Observations, Biodiversity Observation Network, ICCA Consortium, Institute for Biodiversity Network, Inter-American Institute for Global Change Research, International Coral reef Initiative, International Fund for Animal Welfare, International Indigenous Forum on Biodiversity, International Institute for Environment and Development, International Maritime Organization, International Planning Committee for Food Sovereignty, International Women's Biodiversity Network, IUCN, IUCN Conservation Genetics Specialist Group and the Scottish Working Group on Aichi Target 13, Leonardo DiCaprio Foundation, National Geographic Society, Natural Capital Coalition, Natural Resources Defense Council, Nature Conservancy, Nature Conservation Society of Japan, NatureServe, Ocean Unite, OECD, Panthera, the Pew Charitable Trusts, Population Matters, Rainforest Foundation Norway, Rare, Resolve, Royal Society for the Protection of Birds, Secretariat of the International Partnership for the Satoyama Initiative at the United Nations University Institute for the Advanced

4. Parties and observers have expressed a range of views on the possible scope and content of a post-2020 global biodiversity framework. These include views on (I) the ambition level for the post-2020 global biodiversity framework, (II) the relationship between the post-2020 global biodiversity framework, the current Strategic Plan and other relevant processes, (III) the relationship between the Convention and its Protocols, (IV) the elements of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework, including (A) the conceptual framework, (B) the 2050 Vision for Biodiversity, (C) its mission, (D) its strategic goals, (E) biodiversity targets, (F) tools and mechanisms for implementation, (G) review processes, and (H) indicators, (V) participation, (VI) mainstreaming and synergies, (VII) communication and outreach, and (VIII) gaps in the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020 that could be addressed in the post-2020 global biodiversity framework. The views expressed are synthesized below, organized according to these headings.

I. AMBITION OF THE POST-2020 GLOBAL BIODIVERSITY FRAMEWORK

5. A general view is that the post-2020 framework should be ambitious and support the transformational changes needed to realize the 2050 Vision for Biodiversity. The post-2020 global biodiversity framework should serve as a universal framework for action on biodiversity and foster strong ownership and support for its implementation. It should also help to galvanize the political will necessary for its implementation. Its significance should be recognized across the United Nations system as a means to ensure the long-term sustainability of the Earth's ecosystems and to reach the Sustainable Development Goals. It should support effective implementation of action for biodiversity at all scales and it should be based on a narrative that positions nature and biodiversity as the foundation of sustainable development. It should also support collective and individual action at all levels.

6. Despite its limited implementation, the current Strategic Plan (2011-2020) is generally regarded as comprehensive and covers the main aspects that should be addressed going forward. However, many submissions also noted the importance of learning from the successes and failures of the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020 and drawing on all relevant information. The importance of developing the post-2020 global biodiversity framework with the desired impacts in mind was also noted. In this respect it was suggested that as the framework is developed, its drafts should be regularly reviewed to ensure that it will result in desired outcomes, including that it is sufficiently ambitious, transformative, scientifically sound, and responds to national needs.

7. Several submissions have also suggested that the post-2020 global biodiversity framework should remain a broad plan, addressing all key direct and indirect drivers of biodiversity loss. Others suggested that the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity should be "re-oriented" or modified to more explicitly link biodiversity to cultural diversity, equity, human rights, gender, territorial and land tenure rights, and human wellbeing. However, others felt that the focus should remain on biodiversity and not be broadened to include other issues. There was also one suggestion from a non-Party that the issues currently addressed under Strategic Goals A and E should not be included in the post-2020 global biodiversity framework. Conversely some felt that narrowing the focus of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework to a smaller set of issues will not allow achieving the 2050 Vision.

II. RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN THE POST-2020 GLOBAL BIODIVERSITY FRAMEWORK, THE CURRENT STRATEGIC PLAN AND OTHER RELEVANT PROCESSES

8. A view expressed in many submissions is that the post-2020 global biodiversity framework should not be less ambitious than the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020 and that the current plan should serve as a “baseline”. Similarly, some submissions have indicated that the Aichi Biodiversity Targets should be used as a starting point for negotiating the post-2020 global biodiversity framework and that changes to these should be kept to a minimum. However, others have suggested that more significant changes are required.

9. Many suggest that the post-2020 global biodiversity framework should not be less ambitious than or inconsistent with the commitments, frameworks and processes established by other multilateral environmental agreements. In this respect the importance of engaging the biodiversity related conventions in elaborating the post-2020 framework was noted. Similarly, the need for the post-2020 global biodiversity framework to be coherent with and supportive of the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development, the Paris Agreement, the Rio Conventions, the other biodiversity-related conventions, and FAO processes was frequently noted. A general view expressed in several submissions is that the post-2020 global biodiversity framework should be used to reinforce synergies within the United Nations System, including through high-level support. In this respect the need for policy coherence, integration and a holistic approach to the post-2020 global biodiversity framework was also noted.

III. RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN THE CONVENTION AND THE PROTOCOLS

10. The importance of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework reflecting all three objectives of the Convention was noted in several submissions. Having a post-2020 global biodiversity framework that comprehensively addresses the Cartagena and Nagoya Protocols to improve integration and coordinated governance, implementation, review and financing across the Convention and the Protocols was noted in many submissions. A general suggestion made in some submissions was that the post-2020 global biodiversity framework should include general targets or elements on biosafety and access to genetic resources and benefit sharing. Several submissions also suggested that the issues of synthetic biology, digital sequence information and a benefit sharing mechanism should be reflected or accounted for. However, some expressed reservation on the inclusion of these issues. Others noted that discussions on these issues should not prejudice the outcomes of the process foreseen in decision 14/20 on digital sequence information on genetic resources and other relevant decisions of the COP and COP-MOPs.

11. It was also suggested that the post-2020 global biodiversity framework should be adopted through a COP decision as the ratification process for an independent legal instrument such as a protocol would delay the implementation process and would add complexity to the participation of the other biodiversity related conventions.

12. With regard to the Strategic Plan for the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety 2011-2020, it was noted that this plan had a different structure and content than the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020. Some recommended an approach whereby biosafety considerations would be included in the scope of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework, possibly by the inclusion of an objective or target focused on biosafety, with a specific post-2020 implementation plan for the Cartagena Protocol incorporating clear outcomes and indicators. Suggestions of issues related to biosafety that could be reflected in the post-2020 global biodiversity framework noted in the submissions included the development of biosafety legislation, risk assessment and risk management, detection and identification of living modified organisms, socio-economic considerations, liability and redress, and public awareness, education and participation.

13. With regard to the Nagoya Protocol, one suggestion was that the post-2020 global biodiversity framework should reflect the need to fully implement the Nagoya Protocol. It was also suggested that a benefit-sharing mechanism should be reflected in the post-2020 global biodiversity framework. However, there were also concerns expressed on this issue.

III. ELEMENTS OF A POST-2020 GLOBAL BIODIVERSITY FRAMEWORK

A. Conceptual Framework

14. It was suggested that a conceptual framework is needed to link the different elements of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework. Such a framework would facilitate implementation of the post-2020 framework by highlighting linkages between its different elements, and setting out a clear logic for it. A general view expressed was that the conceptual framework must be underpinned by a good understanding of the drivers of biodiversity loss, an understanding of the causal relationships between natural, societal and economic factors and help to identify the responsibilities of the sectors and stakeholders. It was also suggested that the conceptual framework should constitute a holistic approach in developing policy responses.

15. There were a number of suggestions on what a structure for the conceptual framework could be. One suggestion was for a pyramid composed of different layers, including enabling elements, actions and objectives all supporting an apex goal for 2030. Another suggestion was for a set of targets nested under headline targets. Another proposal was for a set of outcome goals under a set of output goals. Others suggested that the framework of the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020 should be retained or modified slightly. Another suggestion was to develop a framework which would reflect the different levels/nature of the Aichi Biodiversity targets (long-term and short-term targets, global and scale-dependent targets, targets under the responsibility of the environment sector and targets under others are sectoral). It was also suggested that the structure of the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development could serve as a possible model for the post-2020 global biodiversity framework. It was also proposed that the conceptual framework should cover the period to 2050 and that there should be ten year rolling plans of action embedded within it.

B. 2050 Vision for Biodiversity

16. In line with decision 14/34, many submissions noted that the 2050 Vision of the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020 is relevant and should be a part of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework. It was also suggested that the rationale for the 2050 Vision should be further developed, and the possible need for milestones for 2030 and 2040 should be explored.

17. Several submissions noted that work is required to develop a common and clear understanding of what reaching the 2050 Vision for Biodiversity entails in concrete terms so that it can effectively inform action to bend the curve of biodiversity loss. The use of backcasting and scenario analysis to accomplish this was noted. It was also suggested that each Party clearly describe what “Living in Harmony with Nature” means according to their national circumstances and to incorporate this into their national biodiversity strategies and action plans.

18. Suggestions on how the 2050 Vision could be defined include:

- (a) The entire planet managed sustainably, supported by sustainable production and consumption, a circular economy, and the sustainable and equitable sharing of benefits from nature;
- (b) 50% of the planet is restored and protected while the whole planet is sustainably managed;
- (c) A Healthy Planet for Healthy People;

19. A number of submissions also identified general conditions or actions required to reach the 2050 Vision. These include:

- (a) Implementing coherent actions at all scales;
- (b) Ensuring that the 2050 deadline does not result in actions being postponed;
- (c) Establishing a small number of milestones or targets for the period between 2020 and 2050 to operationalize the 2050 Vision, such as improving the survival probability of all species and reducing the risk of collapse of all ecosystems to background rates;

(d) Biodiversity conservation and restoration must occur in the context of mainstream economic activity.

C. Mission

20. Many submissions suggested that the post-2020 global biodiversity framework should have an actionable mission statement. Some submissions have suggested that this mission statement could be phrased as a form of “apex” target for the post-2020 global biodiversity framework. It has also been suggested that the mission statement should be time bound, with 2030 generally suggested as a possible end date, however there was one suggestion that 2035 could be used as well. It was also suggested that the mission statement could be articulated in phases up to 2040. A general view also expressed is that the mission statement should serve as a stepping stone towards the 2050 Vision. The need for a clear definition of what the mission statement means in practice was noted. It was also suggested that the mission statement could be accompanied by a slogan, such as “Save Life on Earth Now, Forever”, for communication purposes.

21. A range of views on the focus of the mission for the post-2020 global biodiversity framework were expressed. It was suggested that it should serve as a call to action, be science-based, be framed positively, be inspirational and motivating, be short and easily communicated, easily understandable by the public and political leaders and be focused on implementation. It was also observed that the mission should both address what needs to be achieved by 2030, and what needs to be in place to promote and facilitate appropriate actions in future decades.

22. It was also suggested that the mission statement should be based on the Aichi framework, that it should cover issues such as halting extinctions and preserving ecosystem services, cover the main objectives of the Convention and serve as an umbrella for the entire post-2020 global biodiversity framework. Others suggested that the mission statement should be spatially-based and quantified, covering key biodiversity areas, ecologically or biologically significant areas and other important specific ecosystems. Other ideas were that it should link nature conservation and restoration to human wellbeing, be expressed in terms of planetary boundaries, and link to the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development. Parallels to the 1.5 or 2 degree Celsius targets under the UNFCCC were also made, in particular in relation to the desirability of having a succinct tangible and easily communicated mission statement for the post-2020 framework which unites various priorities. However, some felt that the UNFCCC model was not appropriate owing to the complexities of biodiversity, the Convention on Biological Diversity and its Protocols.

23. Some specific suggestions for a mission statement or apex target were:

(a) Reverse the loss of nature by 2030 and put nature on a path to recovery for the benefit of people and the planet;

(b) Put nature on a path to recovery by 2030 for the benefit of people and the planet by reversing the loss of biodiversity;

(c) Protecting and restoring half of the Earth in its natural state, with integral, functioning, and connected ecosystems that continue to provide for humanity and the rest of life on the planet;

(d) Maintain X% of functioning ecosystems;

(e) Limiting biodiversity loss to 28% mean species abundance;

(f) By 2030, ensure that at least 30% of the earth is covered by effectively managed protected areas and other effective area-based conservation measures (OECMs) of high biodiversity value, encompassing individually a representative range of the earth's ecosystems, including coastal and marine, freshwater and terrestrial ecosystems, with sufficient connectivity and management to ensure the maintenance of their high biodiversity value. (Thereby, strengthen equity and effectiveness of the governance of protected and conserved areas and ensure the integration of their multiple benefits across sectors and in landscapes and seascapes);

(g) By 2030/2035 we will act together to reduce loss of, and to revitalize, biological and cultural diversity. We will do this through integrated ecosystem-based and human rights-based governance at multiple scales, from local to global levels. We will mobilize ambitious commitments and partnerships by all actors across society. This will be implemented with the full recognition of, and support for, diverse values and knowledge systems and for indigenous peoples and local communities' initiatives and contributions towards healthy and sustainable ecosystems and societies;

(h) The post-2020 biodiversity framework must strive for 100% conservation and sustainable use of existing ecosystems;

(i) At least 30% of our oceans and land protected by 2030 — a “30 by 30” target for both land and sea — and then plan to aim to secure 50% by 2050;

(j) Uphold and restore nature's fundamental ecosystem functions for food production, water, climate and other ecosystem services by safeguarding intact natural ecosystems and their biodiversity. Restore degraded ecosystems. Reform economic and sectorial policies: Integrate measures for safeguarding intact ecosystems and ecosystem restoration into national development strategies and development policy in all countries

(k) By 2030, all essential components of nature are effectively conserved or managed to ensure their contribution to the long-term integrity of the biosphere and the services needed for humanity.

(l) We, the people, will foster creative synergies of biological and cultural diversity values through integrated ecosystem-based and human rights-based governance at multiple scales and mobilization of ambitious commitments and partnerships by all actors across society for the post2020 biodiversity strategy. This will be implemented with the full recognition of indigenous peoples and local communities' initiatives and contributions and support for their full and effective participation with their free, prior and informed consent that will support healthy and sustainable societies;

(m) Net gain in the extent (and condition) of natural habitat;

(n) Take effective and urgent action to bend the trend of biodiversity loss in order to reverse the decline in habitats and species by 2030, to secure our planet's variety of life and to contribute the benefit to nature and to the future generation of human community;

(o) Implement all actions necessary and sufficient to, by 2030, stabilize [or improve] [negative] trends in species, ecosystems, and genetic diversity, as the foundation for the delivery of the Sustainable Development Goals and the 2050 Vision for Biodiversity.

D. Strategic Goals

24. There appears to be a general view that the issues addressed by the strategic goals of the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020 remain relevant and that these goals, or the issues they address, should be reflected in the post-2020 global biodiversity framework in some form. However, some submissions also noted that changes to the strategic goals may be needed to make them clearer, and easier to convey. In this respect, the sustainable development goals were identified as a possible example. There was a suggestion that a Strategic Goal related to access and benefit sharing should be included in the post-2020 global biodiversity framework.

E. Biodiversity Targets

25. Submissions expressed a range of general views on possible targets for the post-2020 global biodiversity framework. Many specific formulations or concepts for targets were also submitted and are contained in the annex to this note.

26. There is wide support for the post-2020 global biodiversity framework having a set of biodiversity targets for the period between 2020 and 2030. However the possibility of having targets up to 2040 was also noted. This is meant in part to align it with the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development. However, there were some suggestions for targets with end dates of 2022, 2025 and 2035 as well.

27. Several submissions noted that the Aichi Biodiversity Targets should be used as the basis for developing any new targets and that changes to these should be kept to a minimum. However, it was also noted that some changes to the Aichi Targets will be required to “modernize” them. Similarly, some submissions suggested that the number of targets should remain at twenty but that if needed sub-targets or milestones could be created. However, there was also a suggestion that the post-2020 global biodiversity framework should have fewer targets than the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020

28. It was suggested that global diversity targets should not be end points in themselves but milestones in a longer-term process. In this respect it was suggested that the 2030 Agenda and its Sustainable Development Goals could provide a source inspiration. It was also suggested that both short and long-term targets could be included in the post-2020 global biodiversity framework and that these targets should be more specific. Others felt that targets should have both process and outcome components and/or be a mix of outcome and output targets. It was also suggested that targets which are aspirational, that address the tasks that the biodiversity community is able to address, that relate to interactions with other agendas and enabling activities could be established. The need for targets which promote collaboration, including across the biodiversity-related conventions, at all appropriate levels was also noted.

29. Most submissions emphasized that future biodiversity targets need to be “SMART” (specific, measurable, ambitious, realistic and time-bound). Most submissions also noted the need for clear targets which are easy to communicate and streamlined and which clearly articulate the actions that need to be taken.

30. Most submissions noted the need for targets to be rooted in science and some noted that they should also be rooted in other knowledge systems. The need to develop targets which recognize trade-offs between biodiversity conservation and other goals was also noted. It was also suggested that the new targets should avoid “sound-bite” formulations unless these are based on sound science.

31. The need for targets which can be easily measured was highlighted in many submissions. In this respect the issue of ensuring the availability of indicators (further addressed below) was highlighted. A number of submissions also noted the need for clear baselines and reporting schemes for targets which should also, ideally, be adopted at the same time as the post-2020 global biodiversity framework. One submission suggested that 2018 could serve as a baseline year while another submission suggested that the current Aichi Biodiversity Targets could serve as the baseline. It was also suggested that each target should only have one measurable action.

32. The importance of biodiversity targets in galvanising action to implement the post-2020 global biodiversity framework was emphasized in many submissions. The role of targets in ensuring action across sectors of governments and society was noted. However, for targets to be effective in this it was noted that they should be clear about the desired outcomes, should be adaptable to national and subnational scales as well as different sectors, should provide clear guidance and that all targets should have implementation plans that include cost estimates. It was felt that such information would help to make it clear who is responsible for taking actions for the attainment of the targets and how their achievement can be brought about. Some also felt that targets should be linked to the mandate and work of the other biodiversity-related Conventions and that the governing bodies of other biodiversity-related Conventions should discuss how they could contribute through the implementation of their respective conventions and increase synergies among them. The possibility of developing targets framed as common global contributions which could then be further supported nationally determined contributions was also suggested.

33. One of the noted challenges to the attainment of the Aichi Biodiversity Targets was the difficulty of translating these into national actions and strategies. Allowing countries to adapt global targets to their national contexts was noted as being important. It was also noted that for the targets to spur action they need to be realistic and, in this respect, they need to balance ambition with pragmatism. It was observed that unrealistic targets would only undermine the credibility of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework in the eyes of governments and other actors.

34. Many submissions provided general comments on the possible content and scope of future biodiversity targets. It was suggested in several submissions that biodiversity targets should better reflect the interconnections between targets, that they should address all three objectives of the Convention in a balanced way, that they should better cover the main issues related to biodiversity, including those dealt with by the Cartagena and Nagoya Protocols, the Global Strategy for Plant Conservation, and by other global biodiversity-related Conventions and that they should be focused on actions. Other suggestions were that targets should recognize the need to mainstream biodiversity into all sectors, be integrated with multiple environmental, economic and social objectives, stress the importance of all indirect drivers of biodiversity loss, recognize the impact that population dynamics, plan for the adaptation to further biodiversity loss, and address pro-poor adaptation, the precautionary principle, intergenerational justice, human rights, Indigenous peoples and local communities contributions and rights, gender justice, equity and poverty reduction, benefit sharing, the full participation by rights-holders, planetary boundaries and intergenerational perspective and transformational change. However, it was also suggested that biodiversity targets should only focus on nature and in particular on conserving a certain percentage of habitat types. One observer also suggested that targets currently addressed on Strategic Goals A and E should be eliminated or consolidated in the post-2020 global biodiversity framework.

F. Tools, mechanisms and support for implementation

35. There was general support for having a post-2020 global biodiversity framework that serves as a basis for universal action on biodiversity and which emphasizes implementation. It was also observed that, if the post-2020 global biodiversity framework remains a flexible framework to be adapted to national circumstances, there will be a need to increase the sense of responsibility, accountability and commitment to implement it. More generally, the need to ensure that the post-2020 global biodiversity framework is scalable and has traction and impact at all relevant levels was also noted as being an important element in ensuring its implementation. Relatedly the need to promote and/or develop alliances and initiatives to support implementation was also noted.

36. Many submissions noted that national biodiversity strategies and action plans should continue to be the main instrument for implementing the Convention as well as for implementing the post-2020 global biodiversity framework. However, many submissions also noted that the NBSAP process needs to be strengthened and pointed to the current mismatch between the Aichi Biodiversity Targets and the level of ambition and implementation of the national targets established by Parties in their NBSAPS. It was noted that the NBSAPs need to clearly indicate how national-level efforts will contribute to the global targets, in part to better allow progress to be tracked. It was also suggested that a strengthened NBSAP process, one which is better aligned to the post-2020 global biodiversity framework, would improve transparency and increase the sense of responsibility, ambition, accountability of Parties. The need for a mechanism to review NBSAPs in an objective, scientific and evidence-based manner was highlighted and it was proposed that such a review could be combined with the review of national reports to the Convention. It was also suggested that the NBSAPs could be reviewed and updated as needed, perhaps every five years.

37. Several submissions suggested that the post-2020 global biodiversity framework should include a mechanism to “ratchet up” its implementation. This could take the form of a process to regularly take stock of progress in meeting global targets and re-assess Parties commitments. Other have suggested that it could take the form of a compliance mechanism. The importance of providing space for indigenous peoples and local communities and civil society to participate in any compliance or ratcheting up mechanisms was also noted in some submissions.

38. Several submissions commented on the desirability of voluntary commitments. It was suggested that this could take the form of Parties, individually or in coalitions, being invited to identify national targets and concrete actions to achieve them and this should be followed by an evaluation of the planned cumulative actions. One benefit of this approach is that it would allow each Party to tailor action for their national circumstances and support the principle of “common but differentiated responsibility”. However, others felt that voluntary commitments, while providing useful impetus, may not directly lead the global

community to scientifically-supported goals and outcomes. One Party, while in favour of voluntary commitments, also suggested that a review of these by the Convention was not necessary. It was also noted that voluntary commitment may represent a challenge given the political systems in some countries where the responsibility for biodiversity is shared across several political jurisdictions. Some felt that for such commitments to be meaningful they would need to be seen as whole of government commitments and not just a commitment by a single ministry. Also, it was suggested that a process should be considered for subsequently incorporating voluntary contributions into NBSAPs and other national and subnational planning processes. Another suggestion was that the post-2020 global biodiversity framework serve as a flexible framework for developing national targets which could then be integrated into NBSAPS, similar to what was done for the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020. In addition to voluntary commitments from Parties, many submissions were in favour of encouraging commitments from stakeholders, such as the private sector and civil society, as invited in the Sharm el Sheikh Declaration. Further some submissions also noted the need to make distinctions between commitments from Parties and commitments from other actors.

39. The importance of resource mobilization for the implementation of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework was highlighted. Several submissions noted that the post-2020 framework needs an effective, comprehensive and holistic resource mobilization strategy and that both developed and developing country Parties will have a role to play in its implementation. In this respect, the need for full and effective financing from all sources and from all levels was also emphasized in some submissions. It was also noted that resource mobilization should be adequate, predictable, and additional and reference to Article 20 of the Convention was made. The need to match funding with capacity building and technical support as well as the need to ensure that funding can be effectively utilized was also noted as was the need to ensure that funding is available to assist vulnerable groups.

40. The need to identify resources beyond traditional aid flows was also noted. It was suggested that the issues of subsidy reform, engagement with the private sector, co-funding, blended funding models and partnerships, more targeted and streamlined actions under the Convention, the mainstreaming of biodiversity across all sectors, effective and agreed valuations approaches, biodiversity offsets and innovative sources of finance, like payments for ecosystem services (PES), could be explored as a means to generate resources for the implementation of the post-2020. Relatedly it was suggested that Parties should create enabling policy, legal and regulatory environment for resource mobilization. It was also observed that focusing on multiple approaches to resource mobilization could help to improve the financial sustainability of the implementation process and help to convey that governments alone are not responsible for sustaining nature. Similarly seeking synergies with resource mobilization strategies from the Rio Conventions and other biodiversity-related treaties was also suggested as a means of better using of limited funding. The relevance of the collective actions of indigenous peoples and local communities to resource mobilization was also noted. Further it was suggested that resource mobilization efforts could be facilitated through developing a more manageable set of integrated targets for the post-2020 global biodiversity framework.

41. Other suggestions for tools or mechanisms to support implementation of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework were:

- (a) A more focussed approach to capacity development and technology transfer;
- (b) Natural capital accounting, both at the national level and in the business sector, the green economy and related approaches;
- (c) National ecosystem assessment approaches;
- (d) An effective mechanism to ensure the sharing of benefits arising out of the utilization of genetic resources, including those arising from digital sequence information on genetic resources;
- (e) Means of sharing biodiversity data and promoting transboundary cooperation;
- (f) Nature based approaches;

- (g) The further development of a decision tracking tool;
- (h) The creation of platforms to help create a wider “narrative” around biodiversity, people and the economy.

G. Review process

42. The need for an effective review process in the post-2020 global biodiversity framework to improve transparency and accountability was noted. The continued importance of the national reports in this respect was highlighted. Similarly, the continued importance of the role of the clearing house mechanism of the Convention in sharing information on progress was also noted. However, the need for more effective and robust national reporting, including by having a greater consistency and continuity across the different reporting cycles, making greater use of indicators, increased complementarity with reports provided to other biodiversity-related multilateral environmental agreements and making greater use of online reporting and knowledge management tools, was noted. Further the possibility of making greater use of the voluntary peer-review process in the post-2020 period was also noted. It was also suggested that a group of experts could be established to review the national reports. The initial rounds of voluntary national reviews considered by the High-level Political Forum on Sustainable and the review mechanisms under the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change could provide useful lessons for a review mechanism. The need for review processes to account for the circumstances of Least Developed Countries, Small Island Developing States and the most environmentally vulnerable countries, as well as countries with economies in transition was also noted. It was emphasized that the review process for the post-2020 global biodiversity framework should be transparent and allow for the participation of indigenous peoples and local communities, civil society organizations and other stakeholders. The need to develop mechanisms through which the private sector can fully engage and can provide information of its approaches, experiences and good practices was also noted. However, some submissions also expressed reservations related to the growing role of the private sector in the implementation of the Convention.

43. Some suggested elements of a review process were the use of milestones, encouraging the enhanced use of existing tools and mechanisms across biodiversity-related conventions, including systems for reporting, indicators and information-sharing. It was also suggested that some form of accountability or compliance mechanism should be explored.

44. The need for timely reviews of implementation to help inform the implementation of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework was also emphasized in some submissions. There were suggestions that progress should be reviewed at every meeting of the Conference of the Parties while others suggested every five years. The role of the Global Biodiversity Outlook was noted in this respect. However, it was also noted that different kinds of reports may also be needed, including for specific decisions adopted under the Convention and its two Protocols.

45. Among the other suggestions for a review process were that it should:

- (a) match of the level of ambition and implementation of the NBSAPs;
- (b) have an effective monitoring and modelling framework to assess progress;
- (c) feed into an effective compliance mechanism under the CBD and its Protocols;
- (d) be conducted every two years;
- (e) track individual countries’ progress against the implementation of global CBD commitments;
- (f) examine the progress being made by Parties in a technical, objective, and transparent manner, with the aim of facilitating efforts by Parties;
- (g) include a compliance committee to which alleged breaches of the Convention and its Protocols, as well as non-compliance to the post 2020 objectives can be submitted;

- (h) provide detailed information on approaches and methodologies to evaluate the effectiveness of measures taken to implement the convention;
- (i) undertake a global stocktaking exercise by the Subsidiary Body on Implementation every five years;

H. Indicators

46. The importance of identifying indicators for the different elements of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework was noted in many submissions. Most suggested that the starting point for indicators should be the indicators developed for the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020 noted in decision XIII/28. The indicators used in the IPBES global assessment were also suggested.

47. The need to identify indicators as the post-2020 global biodiversity framework is developed was noted. Some felt that each target should have at least one specific indicator to track progress however others felt that it was important to avoid the use of a single metric for measuring progress. Another suggestion was to identify or develop a few high level or “apex” indicators. The need for indicators which could be used at the global and regional level was also noted.

48. The need for Parties to work with groups already developing indicators to identify indicators for the post-2020 global biodiversity framework was noted. To this end, collaboration with multilateral bodies and processes that have experience in developing and applying biodiversity-related indicators, such as the UN Food and Agriculture Organization and the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development was suggested. The possibility of developing shared biodiversity indicators for the biodiversity-related multilateral environmental agreements was also suggested. Relatedly it was also suggested that a globally harmonized approach to reporting, through the adoption of a standardized set of scalable global biodiversity indicators, would be beneficial. It was also suggested that indicators should identify clear, actionable and measurable responses by countries.

49. A number of tools or approaches to monitoring biodiversity were also identified in the submissions. These include:

- (a) The System of Environmental Economic Accounts;
- (b) Operational national biodiversity observation networks;
- (c) Community-based monitoring and information systems;
- (d) Online indicator visualization tools.

IV. INTEGRATING DIVERSE PERSPECTIVES

50. Many submissions noted that the development and implementation of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework will require a “whole of society approach” as Parties are not the only actors who contribute to implementation of the Convention. Most submissions emphasized the importance of broad level engagement and that the new framework must be a global framework to unify all Parties and stakeholders. The importance of involving those actors capable of bringing about the change necessary to reach the 2050 Vision and the need to engage from early on with institutions and organizations beyond the “usual suspects” was also noted. However, some submissions also identified specific groups that were viewed as being particularly important in the post-2020 process:

(a) Indigenous peoples and local communities: The continued role of Indigenous Peoples and local communities and the importance of traditional and local knowledge was noted in several submissions. It was observed that they are stewards of biodiversity and are key for on the ground implementation. Relatedly some noted that indigenous land conservation and the respect of indigenous rights must also be reflected in the post-2020 process. Further the role of community-based monitoring and information systems in tracking progress in implementing the post-2020 plan was also noted. The

importance of viewing traditional knowledge as a cross-cutting theme of the Convention and for it to be reflected as such was also noted;

(b) Women and gender: Some felt that the post-2020 global biodiversity framework should place more emphasis on the important role and potential contribution of women. It was also noted that the post 2020 framework should build on the Gender Plan of Action 2015-2020, including by developing specific measures to support women's increased involvement within the post-2020 process. It was suggested that in most cases women are only seen as vulnerable groups or groups that need awareness raising were as they should be viewed as "agents of change". It was also observed that rather than treating gender in a binary way the post-2020 global biodiversity framework should recognize the importance of intersectionality (intersecting and interacting identities) in shaping gender roles in, and outcomes from, biodiversity management;

(c) Subnational governments and local authorities: It was observed subnational governments have an important role to play in on the ground implementation of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework and that this needs to be recognized;

(d) Civil Society: The need to enhance the participation, at national, regional and international levels, of civil society in the post-2020 process, including by supporting their participation in relevant meetings and workshops was noted;

(e) Private Sector: It was suggested that pathways for formalising collaborations between the private sector and national focal points for effective integration of business-focused information and contributions in the NBSAPS and associated reporting processes, including the collection, synthesis, analysis and communication of businesses' contributions to the post-2020 framework should be explored. It was also noted that the business sector has a role to play in contributing to science, knowledge, and data generation, the application of the mitigation hierarchy, the application of other effective area-based conservation measures and private protected areas, and awareness-raising, among other actions. The potential of public-private partnerships was also noted as a possible tool to build momentum for the post-2020 global biodiversity framework and for the Sharm El Sheikh to Beijing Action Agenda for Nature and People.

V. MAINSTREAMING AND SYNERGIES

51. Mainstreaming will be the key to the successful implementation of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework and several submissions pointed to the need for the post-2020 global biodiversity to offer greater opportunities for the mainstreaming of biodiversity across society and to develop synergies with other processes. It was noted that the new framework should recognize the pluralism of different interests in biodiversity conservation and the trade-offs that often exist between different stakeholder interests. Similarly, it was noted that the post-2020 global biodiversity framework should recognize that many enabling conditions and actions cannot be adequately delivered through the CBD and environmental ministries alone, and will require inter-ministerial or whole-of-government approaches, and wider societal efforts generally. The need to have a post-2020 global biodiversity framework which generates buy-in from sectors that are reliant on, and have significant impact on, biodiversity was noted. Among the more specific issues identified were:

(a) The need to create greater opportunities for the private sector to play a role in the conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity, including by calling on businesses to develop biodiversity commitments, to support international and regional business summits, and to develop new national and regional business and biodiversity networks. Other issues related to the private sector include creating regulatory environments which require business to conduct their business in a way that reflects a legal duty and responsibility regarding biodiversity and the environment, and which ensures effective implementation and enforcement of environmental laws and regulations and providing incentives and recognition for business engagement. Some specific issues related to the private sector mentioned in submissions were the need for better consideration of biodiversity issues in the procurement of raw materials and supply chain

management, the impacts of trade on the spread of invasive alien species, environmental, social and governance (ESG) investments and promoting the development and/or improvement of metrics, indicators, baselines and other tools to measure the biodiversity dependencies of businesses and their impacts on biodiversity. The potential role of public-private partnerships was also noted. However, others felt that the role of business in CBD processes, as well as its impacts on biodiversity, need careful evaluation to ensure that the influence of the private sector does not become disproportionate to that of other groups;

(b) The importance of aligning a post-2020 global biodiversity framework with other international frameworks and processes was highlighted in many submissions. The role of the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development in enhancing the enabling environment for the post-2020 global biodiversity framework was emphasized in many submissions. It was also noted that aligning the post-2020 global biodiversity framework with the 2030 Agenda will help to avoid the isolation of biodiversity from other global economic and social goals and allow biodiversity to be better mainstreamed and for the post-2020 global biodiversity framework to be implemented more effectively. The need to explore means of reflecting both the non-biodiversity-related goals as well as the biodiversity-related goals of the SDGs into the post-2020 global biodiversity framework was also noted. The importance of the Paris Agreement, adopted under the UNFCCC, was also highlighted in several submissions. It was also suggested that a target on integrating the post-2020 framework in national plans related to other international agreements, such as those of the UNFCCC, UNCCD and the 230 Agenda, could help avoid isolated approaches to implementation and make the best use of limited financial and human resources. One suggested way of creating ownership over the post-2020 process by the biodiversity related conventions was to establish a coordination body of parties to the different biodiversity related conventions. The potential role of the digital data reporting tool (DaRT) developed by UNEP InforMEA was also suggested as a tool which could promote coordination. The potential role of the Satoyama Initiative, including the International Partnership for the Satoyama Initiative (IPSI), as well as Ecosystem-based Approaches to Climate Change Adaptation and Disaster Risk Reduction was also noted;

(c) Productive sectors are both dependent on biodiversity and have an impact on it. Many submissions highlighted the importance of reflecting this in the post-2020 global biodiversity framework. It was suggested that pathways and roadmaps on how societies can develop “in harmony with nature” at various scales need to be explored in collaboration with sectors. In this respect issues related to the circular economy, green growth and the valuation of multiple biodiversity values was noted. It was also suggested that guidance for mainstreaming biodiversity into production sectors using a landscape/seascape approach should be included in the post-2020 framework. The use of environmental impact assessment was also noted as a means reducing the impact of sectors on biodiversity.

VI. COMMUNICATION AND OUTREACH

52. The need for more effective, coherent, comprehensive and targeted communication, both during the development of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework and after its adoption, was noted. Effective communication and engagement during the development of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework was noted as being important for creating a sense of ownership and promoting action at all levels of society. Relatedly the importance of ensuring that the post-2020 global biodiversity framework can be easily communicated was also noted. In this respect, the potential role of biodiversity champions or ambassadors was highlighted as was the importance of involving experts in the field of communication. Suggested ambassadors include business CEOs from developed and emerging economies, investors, civil society organizations, business coalitions and associations to serve as change agents.

53. Some of the specific communication needs identified in the submissions were:

- (a) Increasing understanding, awareness and appreciation of the diverse values of biodiversity;
- (b) Strengthen communication about the consequences of biodiversity loss for the economy;
- (c) Making visible the dramatic risks and costs associated with the current degradation and extinction trends, and raise awareness of possible economic losses for nations and enterprises;

- (d) Raise awareness of all stakeholders of the existence of biodiversity-related targets;
- (e) The need to avoid technical language in communication;
- (f) Promoting meaningful experiences and connectedness with nature;
- (g) Promoting biodiversity education in school curricula;
- (h) The identification or promotion of “champion initiatives” that may generate transformative change for biodiversity outcomes;
- (i) Promoting actions which are mutually supportive and coherent across different international organizations, including by developing mutually supportive messaging across biodiversity-related conventions and organizations, and the Rio Conventions;
- (j) Promoting or developing platforms for Parties, observers and other stakeholders to share information on successes, lessons learned and experiences in acting for biodiversity.

VII. GAPS IN THE STRATEGIC PLAN FOR BIODIVERSITY 2011-2020

54. Many submissions suggested issues that could be better reflected in the post-2020 global biodiversity framework than in the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020. Some of these are related to specific topics or themes while others are cross-cutting in nature. Furthermore, some could be addressed through the development of specific targets while others would have more general implications for the post-2020 global biodiversity framework. Most submissions were not specific on how these different issues should be reflected in the post-2020 global biodiversity framework. The issues can be organized under several general categories and include:

- (a) **Ecosystems:**
 - (i) Conservation and wise use of wetlands;
 - (ii) Marine areas beyond national jurisdiction;
 - (iii) Soil biodiversity;
 - (iv) Freshwater;
 - (v) Habitat connectivity;
 - (vi) Agricultural biodiversity;
 - (vii) Primary forest;
- (b) **Species:**
 - (i) Migratory species;
 - (ii) Sustainable use of terrestrial species;
 - (iii) Pollinators;
 - (iv) Conservation of genetic diversity of wild species;
 - (v) Crop species and traditional varieties, including neglected and underutilized species with high nutrition potential and resilience to environmental changes;
 - (vi) Plants;
- (c) **Major groups:**
 - (i) Religious communities;
 - (ii) Private sector;
 - (iii) Cities;
 - (iv) Indigenous peoples and local communities;
 - (v) Women;
 - (vi) Youth;

- (vii) Farmers;
- (d) **Direct pressures on biodiversity:**
 - (i) Illegal wildlife trade;
 - (ii) Plastics, toxic substances and other pollutants;
- (e) **Indirect pressures on biodiversity:**
 - (i) Trade;
 - (ii) Simplification of food system;
 - (iii) Population dynamics, growth, and migration;
- (f) **Solutions to biodiversity loss:**
 - (i) Nature based solutions;
 - (ii) Transformative approach to conservation;
 - (iii) Conservation efforts to protect biodiversity in transboundary areas;
 - (iv) Landscape connectivity;
 - (v) Creating or expanding ecological corridors;
 - (vi) Marine spatial planning;
 - (vii) Technological solutions;
 - (viii) Other effective area-based conservation measures (OECMs);
 - (ix) Incentives and markets to create biodiverse food production systems;
 - (x) Landscape and seascape approaches;
 - (xi) Polluter pays principle;
- (g) **Implementation issues:**
 - (i) Capacity-building;
 - (ii) Resource mobilization;
 - (iii) Mainstreaming;
 - (iv) Enforcement;
 - (v) Political will;
 - (vi) Education and training;
 - (vii) Tools to measure agrobiodiversity in diets, in markets and in on farm production;
- (h) **Human wellbeing:**
 - (i) Gender;
 - (ii) Cultural diversity;
 - (iii) Health;
 - (iv) Local sustainable use and consumption;
 - (v) Peace, and conflict;
 - (vi) Food security;
 - (vii) Land tenure;
 - (viii) Cultural knowledge and diversity;
- (i) **Communication:**
 - (i) Ambitious communications plan;
 - (ii) Integrate biodiversity into education and learning programmes;
 - (iii) Policy measures to support community conservation;

55. In addition to the points listed above and as already noted, several submissions expressed the need to include aspects related to biosafety and access and benefit-sharing more explicitly in the post-2020 global biodiversity framework. It was also suggested that the Global Strategy for Plant Conservation should be reviewed and integrated into the relevant sections/parts of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework.

56. While many submissions identified issues that should be reflected in the post-2020 global biodiversity framework, some submissions also cautioned against expanding the scope of the plan excessively as it could lose focus, and biodiversity issues could become less prominent. Some expressed the view that the post-2020 global biodiversity framework should focus on the overall trends and drivers of biodiversity loss.

VIII. SUMMARY

57. Many of the submissions received to date have focused on general issues or concepts. An exception to this general trend is the issue of biodiversity targets where numerous suggestions on the possible wording for new targets have been made.

58. Based on the submissions to date, the following issues can be identified:

(a) The post-2020 global biodiversity framework needs to be commensurate with the challenges of fostering the transformational change required to address biodiversity loss and achieve the 2050 Vision;

(b) The post-2020 global biodiversity framework should serve as a universal framework for action on biodiversity;

(c) The post-2020 global biodiversity framework should serve to raise the profile of current biodiversity challenge, engage attention at a high political level and mobilize action from all stakeholders;

(d) The post-2020 global biodiversity framework should not be less ambitious than the current Strategic Plan for Biodiversity, the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development or any other biodiversity-related plan or framework adopted under a multilateral environmental agreement;

(e) The post 2020 global biodiversity framework should build from the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020. Many have suggested that this should be the starting point for discussions. However there have also been suggestions to bring in new elements which would significantly expand the scope of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework in comparison to its predecessors. Conversely some submissions have cautioned against expanding the scope of the framework.

(f) The post-2020 global biodiversity framework should link to and support, in a coherent and synergistic manner, other frameworks and processes which have a direct bearing on biodiversity, in particular the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development, the Paris Agreement on Climate Change, and other relevant processes adopted by the biodiversity related conventions;

(g) The post-2020 global biodiversity framework needs to address the three objectives of the Convention in a balanced way as well as reflect issues related to access and benefit sharing and biosafety;

(h) The different elements of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework should be linked through a conceptual framework. Some have suggested that this should be based on the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity while others are suggesting alternative approaches, including a pyramid approach with layers of objectives, actions and targets in support of an “apex goal” and combinations of outcome and output targets;

(i) The 2050 Vision of the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020 of “Living in Harmony with Nature by 2050” remains relevant and should be a part of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework. Many have noted the need to better articulate what this Vision means in concrete terms and various possible interpretations have been presented;

(j) The post-2020 global biodiversity framework should contain targets which are specific, measurable, ambitious, realistic and time-bound. These targets should be knowledge based, including on scientific and traditional knowledge, address both desired outcomes and processes, be easy to communicate and be designed to galvanize action across society. There is support for using the Aichi Biodiversity Target as a starting point for discussing future targets. Some expressed the view that changes to the Aichi Targets should be kept limited. Others have suggested more comprehensive changes and numerous suggestions for additional or revised targets have been proposed;

(k) It has been suggested that the number of biodiversity targets should be limited to 20. However, given the ideas expressed for new targets it appears that some would like to increase the number of targets. Conversely there has also been a suggestion to limit the number of targets. Some have suggested using a nested target approach or developing sub-targets. The 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development has been suggested as a useful model in this respect;

(l) Indicators, building on those identified for the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020, should be identified and developed in parallel to the development of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework;

(m) The post-2020 global biodiversity framework should foster strong ownership and support concrete actions and contributions for its immediate implementation from Parties, other Governments, subnational and local governments, and cities, as well as indigenous peoples and local communities, relevant international organizations, civil society organizations, women's and youth organizations, the private and financial sectors and other stakeholders;

(n) The national biodiversity strategies and actions plans should continue to be the main instrument for implementing the convention and the post-2020 global biodiversity framework. However, these need to be strengthened;

(o) The post-2020 global biodiversity framework should have a focus on implementation and have an effective process for monitoring and an effective review process to improve transparency and accountability. However, the specifics for accomplishing this beyond the established national reporting and voluntary peer-review process needs to be determined. The establishment of a "ratcheting up" mechanism and a compliance process were suggested. Similarly, the need to regularly review progress in implementation, possibly every two or five years, was raised;

(p) There is general support for voluntary commitments from Parties and the Private sector. However, the statements have been general and have not articulated what this would entail in practice;

(q) The importance of developing a holistic resource mobilization strategy to mobilize resources from all sources was noted. Some also suggested that this strategy should incorporate innovative financial mechanism. However, some expressed reservation regarding the role of the private sector in the implementation of the Convention;

(r) The post-2020 global biodiversity framework should have a coherent and comprehensive communication and outreach action plan to promote awareness of, and effective engagement in its implementation. This plan should encourage whole of societal engagement and reach beyond the biodiversity community;

(s) The post-2020 global biodiversity framework should effectively incorporate gender considerations and the perspectives of indigenous peoples and local communities;

(t) The post-2020 global biodiversity framework should have a focus on mainstreaming biodiversity within sectors and across society;

(u) Various gaps in the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020 have been identified. Some felt that these should be addressed in the post-2020 global biodiversity framework.

Annex

SUGGESTED TARGET FORMULATIONS AND TOPICS

1. Many of the submissions suggested specific formulations for future biodiversity targets and/or identified issues that should be reflected in targets. These suggestions can be grouped under a number of broad headings:

(a) Species

- 1) By 2030, 80% of all known rare, threatened and socio-economically important wild plant species are conserved ex situ, and viable populations are effectively managed in situ, preferably in connected ecologically functional biodiverse landscapes. Improve the survival probability of all species;
- 2) Reduce and/or reverse the losses of all species;
- 3) Support the conservation of specific species;
- 4) Prevent species extinctions and reverse the decline of wildlife populations;
- 5) Reduce the pressure of illegal and unsustainable trade in wild flora and fauna on biodiversity, and enhance the benefits to wildlife conservation and human well-being that derive from legal wildlife trade at sustainable levels;
- 6) Illegal trade in elephant, rhino and tiger products reduced by 50%;
- 7) Unauthorized timber exports reduced by 50% or more from countries with significant illegal trade from high conservation value forests;
- 8) Risk of overexploitation reduced by 30% for “high risk” shark species in trade;
- 9) Best practice guidelines (e.g. the FairWild Standard recognized by the CBD’s Global Strategy for Plant Conservation) applied to trade in 50 priority wild plant value chains;
- 10) Robust traceability mechanisms established for high risk wild species in trade;
- 11) Halt and reverse the loss of agricultural biodiversity, particularly in situ;
- 12) A target on actions aimed at preventing extinctions and recovering threatened species;
- 13) A target focused on connectivity, embedding conservation of site networks and ecological processes into spatial planning and development activities at land/seascape, range-wide or flyway-scales;
- 14) A target on plants
- 15) A target related to migratory species;

(b) Ecosystems and habitats

- 1) By 2030, at the latest, coherent land use policies have been introduced for all land use types with a view to decrease the overall intensity of land use with the use of financial incentives;
- 2) Sustainably manage the coastal and marine areas outside of those covered by fully or highly protected marine protected areas (MPAs), as well as other effective area-based conservation measures (OECMs) which ensure at least equivalent conservation outcomes, thus adding up to 100% of the ocean sustainably managed to prevent significant adverse impacts on the coastal and marine ecosystems;
- 3) Reduce the risk of collapse of all ecosystems to background rates;
- 4) Reduction of all deforestation and natural habitat conversion to zero by 2030;

- 5) Stabilize or increase the extent and quality of natural ecosystems and their services and restore degraded ecosystems to maintain ecological function and the provisioning of ecosystem services such as for food, clean water, clean air;
 - 6) Increasing efforts to restore ecosystems and habitats based on Aichi Target 15, focusing on synergies between resilient and functioning ecosystems and adaptation to climate change, for example through enhancing connectivity;
 - 7) Targets that prioritize the need to secure sufficiently large areas of the remaining intact forests, and that primary forests are protected from exploitation while respecting the rights of indigenous peoples;
 - 8) A target on the promotion of connectivity throughout restoration;
 - 9) A target on developing and implementing national marine spatial planning;
 - 10) A target on soil biodiversity;
 - 11) A target on deep ocean sea beds;
 - 12) A target on agriculture and food systems;
 - 13) A target on enhancing carbon stocks
- (c) **Genetic Diversity**
- 1) By 2030, 80% of the genetic diversity of crops, including their wild relatives (CWR) and other domesticated socio-economically and culturally valuable plant species, is maintained, and strategies have been developed and implemented for minimizing genetic erosion and safeguarding their genetic diversity;
 - 2) The conservation of genetic diversity of wild species;
 - 3) A target related to biosafety;
- (d) **Direct pressures on biodiversity**
- 1) By 2030, invasive species are controlled or eradicated in 80% of areas important for plant diversity, and measures are in place to manage pathways to prevent new introductions and establishment of invasive [pests and diseases – or organisms];
 - 2) By 2030 there has been a 50% reduction in the number of species threatened by international trade;
 - 3) A target on the number of oceanic islands to have invasive mammals eradicated and its expected cost and benefits;
 - 4) A target on minimizing the impact of infrastructure and related sectors on biodiversity;
- (e) **Indirect pressures on biodiversity**
- 1) By 2030, 95% of agriculture, aquaculture, and forestry products come from certified sustainable sources;
 - 2) Subsidies in productive sectors (agriculture, fisheries, forestry etc.) harmful to biodiversity are eliminated by 2030;
 - 3) Ensuring full elimination (100%) and redirection of incentives harmful to biodiversity by 2030;
 - 4) By 2030, at the latest, coherent resource use policies have been introduced with a view to decrease global resource use with the use of financial incentives based on the principle of global justice;

- 5) Divestment from 50 per cent of public and private investments and incentives, including subsidies, harmful to biodiversity by 2025 and 100 per cent by 2030 in order to minimize or avoid negative impacts. The funds redirected from perverse investments and incentives shall be used to support positive incentives for the conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity and systemic alternatives to harmful economic activities, contributing significantly to resource mobilization.
 - 6) A target related to the impacts of trade;
 - 7) A target related to the elimination of subsidies and other mechanisms which promote private or public-sector activities that are harmful to the environment and especially to biodiversity;
 - 8) A target that addresses the shift to more balanced, primarily plant-based diets in countries and societies with high meat and dairy consumption levels;
 - 9) A target on diet shifts and waste reduction;
 - 10) A target on improving yields and making markets more sustainable;
 - 11) A target on ensuring the whole planet is completely sustainably managed;
 - 12) A target regarding a 100% redirection and phasing out of perverse incentives;
 - 13) A target on sustainable consumption and production patterns;
 - 14) A target on the importance of on-farm production of diverse crops and of consumption of diverse diets, including the contribution of wild foods (plant, fish, forest products, fruits, nuts, etc) to health and wellbeing;
 - 15) A target on population dynamics;
- (f) **Enabling actions for biodiversity**
- 1) Each party shall have developed national biodiversity strategies and actions plans with the full involvement of subnational governments, cities and other local authorities and committed to encouraging and supporting local and subnational governments to develop their own biodiversity strategies and action plans with a view to letting at least the immediate subnational governments in each Party to establish their NBSAP by 2030 or possibly 2025, making efforts to enhance the capacity of local and subnational governments to achieve the post-2020 framework;
 - 2) By 2030, the traditional knowledge, innovations and practices of indigenous peoples and local communities relevant for the conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity, and their customary use of biological resources, are respected, subject to national legislation and relevant international obligations, and fully integrated and reflected in the implementation of the Convention with the full and effective participation of indigenous peoples and local communities, at all relevant levels;
 - 3) By 2030, regulatory and other policy frameworks that ensure a 100% divestment from activities that cause ecosystem destruction;
 - 4) By 2030, disclosure of financial risks from biodiversity loss related to investors and businesses becomes mandatory;
 - 5) For all genetic resources that are accessed for their utilization, as well as for subsequent applications and commercialization, fair and equitable benefit-sharing agreements are in place based on free, prior and informed consent and mutually agreed terms with the relevant custodians of the genetic resources;
 - 6) By 2025, biodiversity and sustainability proofing standards have been developed for the integration of biodiversity values into national and local development and poverty reduction

- strategies and planning processes, which enables good governance in the pursuit of biodiversity objectives;
- 7) By 2030, 75% of botanic gardens, arboreta and other plant-based organizations are delivering messages on the importance of plant diversity and at least 500 million people are aware of the value of plant diversity and the steps they can take to conserve and use it sustainably.
 - 8) A target on a comprehensive and integrated approach to climate change, sustainable development and nature through improved synergies between the relevant multilateral agreements and through greater cohesion with major fora that influence global trade and economic objectives;
 - 9) By 2030, all countries have accessible and comprehensive online information systems and inventories on their flora and plant based habitats, at least 80% of plant species have been assessed for their conservation status, and the science base and required technologies are in place to protect plant diversity;
 - 10) By 2022, all the Parties update and revise their NBSAPs in line with post-2020 global biodiversity framework
 - 11) Regional consultation workshops will be held X times in 2021, to support the development of NBSAPs by Parties.
 - 12) A target on recognizing the territorial and land tenure rights of Indigenous Peoples and local communities embodying sustainable lifestyles should be adopted, also because such recognition has proven to be a highly effective measure to conserve and restore biodiversity;
 - 13) A target on recognizing, on the basis of Free Prior and Informed Consent, Indigenous Peoples and local communities conserved territories and areas (ICCAs) and Sacred Natural Sites;
 - 14) A target on enhanced recognition of the role, rights and participation of women in biodiversity conservation and restoration;
 - 15) A target on the need to protect those who defend territories and lands rich in biodiversity;
 - 16) A target on environmental human rights defenders
 - 17) A target on good governance, public and private financing, capacity-building, communications, partnerships and empowerment;
 - 18) A target on the collection, analysis and delivery of marine, freshwater and terrestrial biodiversity observations;
 - 19) A target on gender;
 - 20) A target related to good governance, including effective enforcement of laws, transparency of process, and empowerment of vulnerable groups such as Indigenous Peoples and Local Communities;
 - 21) A target related to building additional capacity and support for the removal of barriers to reduce gaps in implementation and reporting;
 - 22) A target related to generating and sharing information to support implementation
 - 23) A target on incorporating the value of biodiversity into national accounting processes
- (g) **Resource mobilization for the post-2020 global biodiversity framework**
- 1) By 2030, all parties will mobilize adequate domestic financial resources, as well as mobilize increased official development assistance for those parties in a position to do so, and ensure effective enabling conditions to facilitate a substantial increase in private investment flows in biodiversity, such that the aggregate level of financial resources flowing to biodiversity

conservation are adequate to meet the world's and each Party's biodiversity goals, approximating \$400 billion annually

- 2) 1% of GDP is spent on biodiversity conservation nationally as well as internationally through a global financial mechanism
- 3) A target related to the provision of sufficient resources from national, bilateral and multilateral sources, and non-state actors;

(h) Benefits from biodiversity

- 1) By 2030, the value of ecosystem integrity is prioritized, and levels of ecological intactness are maintained or enhanced across all ecosystems, with a particular emphasis on maintaining the most intact areas;
- 2) Ensure fair and equitable sharing of benefits arising from the use of genetic resources and associated traditional knowledge and promote adequate access to genetic resources and associated traditional knowledge;
- 3) Retaining intact ecosystems and restoring degraded ecosystems to maintain and improve ecosystem services such as clean water and air, maximising nature's contributions to people;
- 4) A target on the health problems caused by loss of biodiversity, environmental services and the new dynamics of infectious diseases;
- 5) A target on the nexus between human health and biodiversity;
- 6) A target on getting people closer to nature;
- 7) A target on the management of the rest of the planet sustainably, supported by responsible production and consumption (including mainstreaming actions) and the equitable distribution of resources;
- 8) A target on the contribution of biodiversity and ecosystems to people;
- 9) A target recognizing the positive impact of healthy ecosystems on human health;
- 10) A target on the role of agricultural biodiversity in contributing to human health and the importance of mainstreaming and safeguarding agrobiodiversity to nourish people and sustain the planet;

(i) Protected areas and other effective area based conservation measures:

- 1) 30 per cent of the territorial waters and contiguous zones of semi-enclosed seas are protected and managed effectively;
- 2) By 2030 at least 30% of Earth be covered by well-connected systems of protected areas and Other Effective Area-Based Conservation Measures (OECMs), and managed, where appropriate, as ecological networks;
- 3) At least 30 per cent of terrestrial and inland water areas and 30 per cent of oceans must be conserved through an effectively and equitably managed, ecologically representative, well-connected systems of highly protected areas and Other Effective Area Based Conservation Measures - covering areas important for biodiversity including Key Biodiversity Areas, Ecologically and Biologically Significant Marine Areas, intact ecosystems and ecosystem services;
- 4) Protect at least 30% of land and sea by 2030 and at least 50 percent of land and sea by 2050 in interconnected networks of protected areas designed to the conserving Earth's full diversity of life;

- 5) Increase protected area targets to at least 30% by 2030 with a long-term goal of 50% protection;
 - 6) Increase the percentage of highly protected marine areas to 30 per cent by 2030;
 - 7) Protect at least 30% of the planet's key coastal and marine areas by 2030, through effectively and equitably managed, ecologically representative and well-connected systems of fully or highly protected marine protected areas (MPAs)*, as well as other effective area-based conservation measures (OECMs) which ensure at least equivalent conservation outcomes and promote thriving wildlife and ecosystems, building on Aichi Target 11;
 - 8) Sustainably manage the coastal and marine areas outside of those covered by fully or highly protected marine protected areas (MPAs), as well as other effective area-based conservation measures (OECMs) which ensure at least equivalent conservation outcomes, thus adding up to 100% of the ocean sustainably managed to prevent significant adverse impacts on the coastal and marine ecosystems;
 - 9) Triple protected area coverage by 2030, and better address: the location of protected areas, implementation, representativeness, connection, and concerns derived from large-scale extractive projects in coastal and oceanic areas;
 - 10) Increase spatial conservation, sustainable use and restoration efforts on land and oceans, including but not limited to strengthened efforts in the governance of protected and indigenous/community conserved areas;
 - 11) Ensure that MPAs and OECMs are well-managed, effective, offering positive and sustained long-term outcomes for the in situ conservation of biodiversity and that OECMs attributed to Aichi Target 11 or the new post-2020 marine spatial target follow all relevant guidelines and offer conservation outcomes at least equal to those of fully or highly protected MPAs;
 - 12) By 2030, at least of 15% of each ecological region and 75% of areas important for plant diversity are identified and protected.
 - 13) At least half of our lands and oceans are protected;
 - 14) A target on World Heritage, at both global and national levels;
 - 15) Appropriately and legally recognize and protect against external threats at least 50 per cent of collective lands, waters and territories of life of Indigenous peoples and local communities by 2025, and 100 per cent by 2030, in accordance with their self-determined governance systems, customary laws and community protocols, and free, prior and informed consent.
 - 16) A target related to expanding protected and conserved areas and strengthening their management, and ensuring similar expansion and strengthening of Other Effective Area-Based Conservation Measures (OECMs), including Indigenous and Conserved Communities Areas (ICCAs).
-