



Convention on Biological Diversity

Distr.
LIMITED

CBD/WG2020/1/L.1
30 August 2019

ORIGINAL: ENGLISH

OPEN-ENDED WORKING GROUP
ON THE POST-2020 GLOBAL
BIODIVERSITY FRAMEWORK

First meeting
Nairobi, 27-30 August 2019

DRAFT REPORT OF THE MEETING

INTRODUCTION

1. The first meeting of the Open-ended Working Group on the Post-2020 Global Biodiversity Framework was held at the United Nations offices in Nairobi, Kenya, from 27 to 30 August 2019.

Attendance

2. The meeting was attended by representatives of the following Parties and other Governments: [to be completed].
3. Observers from the following United Nations bodies, specialized agencies, convention secretariats and other bodies also attended: [to be completed]
4. The following organizations were also represented as observers: [to be completed].

ITEM 1. OPENING OF THE MEETING

5. The meeting was opened at 10 a.m. on Tuesday 27 August by Mr. Francis Ogwal, Co-Chair of the Working Group.
6. Opening statements were made by Mr. Hamdallah Zedan on behalf of the Bureau of the Presidency of the Conference of the Parties (COP); Ms. Cristiana Paşca Palmer, Executive Secretary of the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD); and Ms. Inger Andersen, Executive Director of the United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP).
7. Mr. Zedan recalled the commitment of ministers in the Sharm el Sheikh Declaration to support both the development and implementation of a post-2020 global biodiversity framework, which built on the Aichi Biodiversity Targets and the lessons learnt from the implementation of the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011–2020; was aligned with the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development; and was sufficiently ambitious and practical to achieve the transformation required to achieve the 2050 vision for biodiversity. The level of ambition would be defined on the basis of the latest scientific assessments, and the goals and targets should be accompanied by the necessary financial and other means and mechanisms for reviewing progress and holding each other accountable. All Parties should be engaged in a fair and balanced way, and all other sectors associated with direct and indirect drivers of biodiversity loss should be engaged. The potential of nature-based solutions should be highlighted, in which biodiversity could contribute to mitigating and adapting to climate change, food security, health and well-being.
8. Ms. Paşca Palmer thanked participants; the host, UNEP; the Governments of Austria, Finland, Germany, Sweden, Switzerland and the United Kingdom and the European Commission for supporting participation at the meeting; and the CBD Secretariat. She noted the strengthened scientific basis of

CBD's work, increasing attention to biodiversity and new partnerships at the highest levels of government, business and civil society. Biodiversity was moving up the international agenda, resulting in increased political attention in major forums, including the G7 and the G20. Ever greater numbers of the public, led by youth, were calling for action. Much work remained, however, to ultimately "bend the curve" of biodiversity loss and achieve the 2050 vision of the Convention, to live in harmony with nature. Solutions to the challenge of the biodiversity crisis had been outlined in recent reports, including the IPBES Global Assessment and the OECD Biodiversity: Finance and the Economic and Business Case for Action Report. Since COP-14, the CBD Secretariat had organized a number of multi-stakeholder regional and thematic consultations that had raised critical issues; further consultations had been organized by partners, and the CBD Protocols had held consultations. The process would be led by Parties and based on science, the traditional knowledge of indigenous peoples and local communities (IPLCs) and the experience of Parties in implementing the Convention. Paraphrasing Nelson Mandela, she said that, as a community, now was the time to let greatness blossom.

9. Ms. Andersen noted that the post-2020 global framework would be crucial for arresting biodiversity loss, the implications of which were becoming clearer every year, resulting in the loss of food, water, energy, raw materials, medicines and cultural and spiritual well-being. Efforts to avert the crisis through the Aichi Targets had not been successful, and the framework would provide a second chance. It should include learning from mistakes made in setting the Aichi Targets, mainly because they were agreed without baselines, measurable indicators or the buy-in of the sectors involved; setting more ambitious targets, such as for protected marine and terrestrial areas; protecting and promoting biodiversity in our fields, cities and in infrastructure; ensuring not only the quantity but the quality of what is protected; securing buy-in from outside the conservation movement, such as agriculture, infrastructure, public works, municipal planning and others sectors of land use; setting science-based, ambitious, measurable, feasible targets, so that business, agriculture and infrastructure could measure their performance on a biodiversity scale of impact; and setting an apex target for biodiversity, similar to the target of 1.5 °C for climate change, which would simplify the complex issue of biodiversity to increase engagement. A composite scale that combined species, genetic and ecosystem diversity would allow the public to follow and understand, to vote and to lobby for biodiversity conservation. Targets, however, meant nothing without the right solutions. Society was increasingly recognizing and responding to the environmental challenge and holding governments to account. Political will, synergy among sectors, targets and agreements, solutions and strengthening national capacity would be critical. Biodiversity conservation should be at the top of the agenda in every boardroom, ministry and international process.

10. Statements were made by the following regional groups: Egypt on behalf of the African Group, Kuwait on behalf of the Asia-Pacific Region, Finland for the European Union and its Member States, Tajikistan on behalf of Central and Eastern Europe, Costa Rica on behalf of the Group of Latin America and the Caribbean (GRULAC) and New Zealand on behalf of Japan, the United States of America, Canada, Australia, New Zealand and Norway and also Iceland, Israel and Switzerland.

11. Statements were also made by representatives of International Indigenous Forum on Biodiversity (IIFB), Local Governments for Sustainability (ICLEI), Global Youth Biodiversity Network (GYBN), CBD Alliance, CBD Women's Caucus and International Union for Nature Conservancy (IUCN).

ITEM 2. ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA AND ORGANIZATION OF WORK

A. Adoption of the agenda

12. At the 1st session of the meeting, on 27 August 2019, the Working Group took up consideration of the agenda of the meeting.

13. The Working Group adopted the following agenda on the basis of the provisional agenda prepared by the Executive Secretary in consultation with the Bureau:

1. Opening.
2. Adoption of the agenda and organization of work.

3. Reports of consultations and other contributions to the post-2020 process.
4. Potential elements of the structure and scope of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework.
5. Future work programme of the Open-ended Working Group and allocation of tasks to other intersessional bodies and processes.
6. Other matters.
7. Adoption of the report.
8. Closing.

Election of officers

14. The Bureau of the Conference of Parties will serve as the Bureau of the Working Group.
15. It was agreed that Ms Helena Jeffery Brown, Antigua and Barbuda, would act as Rapporteur for the meeting.

Organization of work

16. At the 1st session of the meeting, on 27 August 2019, the Co-Chairs invited the Working Group to adopt the proposed organization of work contained in annex I to the annotated provisional agenda (CBD/WG2020/1/1/Add.1).
17. In considering the item, the Working Group had before it a “scenario note” prepared by the Co-Chairs (CBD/WG2020/1/1/Add.2) further describing the organization of work of the Working Group at this first and subsequent meetings.

ITEM 3. REPORTS OF CONSULTATIONS AND OTHER CONTRIBUTIONS TO THE POST-2020 PROCESS

18. At the 1st session of the meeting, on 27 August 2019, the Working Group took up agenda item 3. Under this item, the Working Group had before it a note by the Executive Secretary on the regional and thematic consultations conducted and other contributions received regarding the post-2020 process (CBD/WG2020/1/2). It also had before it two synthesis of views of Parties and observers on the scope and content of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework (CBD/POST2020/PREP/1/INF/1) and (CBD/POST2020/PREP/1/INF/2), the reports of the regional consultation workshops on the post-2020 global biodiversity framework for Asia and the Pacific (CBD/POST2020/WS/2019/1/2), the Western European and Others Group and Other Members of the European Union (CBD/POST2020/WS/2019/2/2), Africa (CBD/POST2020/WS/2019/3/2), Central and Eastern Europe (CBD/POST2020/WS/2019/4/2), Latin America and the Caribbean (CBD/POST2020/WS/2019/5/2), the report of the consultation workshop of biodiversity related Conventions on the Post-2020 Global Biodiversity Framework (CBD/POST2020/WS/2019/6/2), and the report of the Expert Workshop to Develop Recommendations for Possible Gender Elements in the Post-2020 Global Biodiversity Framework (CBD/GB/OM/1/2).
19. The Working Group also had before it a non-paper prepared by the Co-Chairs of the Working Group, on their reflections regarding the process for development of a post-2020 global biodiversity framework (non-paper 1).
20. Professor Dorington Ogoyi, Director and Chief Executive Office, National Biosafety Authority, Kenya, reported on the Global Consultation Workshop on the Post-2020 Global Biodiversity Framework, Biosafety and the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety which were held on 25 August 2019 in Nairobi. Small groups had discussed how biosafety could contribute to achieving the objectives of the Convention and the 2050 Vision of living in harmony with nature. Although most of the 17 SDGs were either directly or indirectly related to the implementation of the Cartagena Protocol and biosafety was relevant to more than three quarters of the Aichi Targets, there was no explicit mention of biosafety in the current Strategic Plan for Biodiversity. Therefore, a specific biosafety element should be included in the post-2020 global

biodiversity framework, linked to Articles 8(g) and 19 and to provisions in the Convention on research, technology and technical and scientific cooperation. Mainstreaming biosafety throughout the new framework would raise its profile and ensure that it was taken into account in national biodiversity strategy and action plans (NBSAPs). A key issue was the role of new technologies in the conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity and how those could be addressed in the post-2020 global biodiversity framework, with suitable regulatory frameworks. As new technologies fell at the interface of the Cartagena and Nagoya Protocols, coordination was essential. It would be important to hear the perspectives of IPLCs on new technologies. Participants had noted that the Nagoya–Kuala Lumpur Supplementary Protocol on Liability and Redress could provide environmental safeguards for new technologies and an example for addressing liability and redress for damage to biodiversity. Participants had commented that biosafety led to conservation and sustainable use of biological diversity and had noted that all Parties had obligations for biosafety.

21. Ms Christine Akello Echokit, Deputy Executive Director, National Environment Management Authority, Uganda, reported on the consultation on the Nagoya Protocol, which had been held on 25 August 2019 in Nairobi. Participants had shared experiences on the contribution of Aichi Biodiversity Target 16 on ratification and implementation of the Nagoya Protocol and had identified potential elements of access and benefit-sharing (ABS) and the Nagoya Protocol that could be included in the new framework. They had suggested that a specific segment on ABS be included in elements for strengthening implementation of both the Nagoya Protocol and the Convention. Parties to the CBD that had not yet ratified the Protocol could be encouraged and supported by inclusion in the framework of a new target on ratification. Rules and procedures were required for monitoring progress, with capacity-building and active involvement of stakeholders. Work was necessary on how Parties and non-Parties to the Protocol could develop cross-cutting goals and integration of ABS into other areas of work of the CBD. The importance of traditional knowledge and its relation to ABS had been highlighted, and it had been proposed that collaboration with IPLCs be included in the new framework, with technical guidance for implementation of the Protocol. The consultation had also touched on synergies with other international instruments, especially with the International Treaty for Plant Genetic Resources.

22. Ms Ana Maria Hernandez, Chair of IPBES, presented the science base for the post-2020 global biodiversity framework from thematic, methodological, regional and global assessments of existing information, building capacity for decision-makers, experts and stakeholders and fostering understanding of tools and methods for policy decisions. The global assessment of the status of biodiversity and ecosystem services had involved its 132 Member States and more than 2000 experts in over 100 countries in natural, social, human, economic and political sciences, as well as experts in indigenous and local knowledge. The assessment had received much attention and served as a call to action. The authors of the assessment had ranked the first five direct drivers of change in nature with regard to their global impacts as: (1) changes in land and sea use, (2) direct exploitation of organisms, (3) climate change, (4) pollution and (5) invasive alien species. Recognizing the knowledge, innovations, practices, institutions and values of IPLCs and their inclusion and participation in environmental governance enhanced their quality of life as well as nature conservation and sustainable use; however, indigenous and local knowledge was declining in all regions. Despite progress in the conservation of nature, the assessment had found that international goals for conserving and sustainably using nature could not be met on current trajectories. Goals for 2030 and beyond could be achieved only through transformative economic, social, political and technological change. The authors of the assessment had concluded that the negative trends in nature, ecosystem functions and in many of nature's contributions to people would continue beyond 2050 with projected increases in land and sea use, exploitation of organisms and climate change; however, plausible scenarios that included transformative change in the production and consumption of energy and food, low-to-moderate population growth and nature-friendly, socially fair climate adaptation and mitigation were compatible with the 2030 objectives and the 2050 vision for biodiversity. By its nature, transformative change could expect opposition from those with interests vested in the status quo, but such opposition could be overcome for the broader public good. The assessment listed five main "levers" that could generate transformative change by addressing the indirect drivers of nature deterioration: incentives

and capacity-building, cross-sectoral cooperation, pre-emptive action, decision-making in the context of resilience and uncertainty and environmental law and its implementation.

23. Ms. Theresa Mundita S. Lim, Executive Director, ASEAN Centre for Biodiversity, reported on progress in the work of the informal CBD advisory group on mainstreaming. She recalled that, after reviewing the contribution of mainstreaming into economic sectors at COP 13 and 14, the Parties had proposed in decision 14/3 a long-term strategic approach for mainstreaming biodiversity and establishment of an informal advisory group to the Executive Secretary and the Bureau. The Group consisted of 15 experts from Parties and 15 from organizations relevant to the topic, and a consultative network of 35 organizations had been formed. The group worked remotely, with regular webinars, surveys and teleconferences. The consultations had confirmed that mainstreaming was a pathway to achieving transformational change in the post-2020 global biodiversity framework. Participants had agreed that the approach and its means of verification should be clearly aligned with the SDGs and with the objectives and targets of key actors such as the private sector and development agencies. Many proposed an “engagement platform”. Mainstreaming could involve coordinating biodiversity governance and policies among ministries, harmonizing biodiversity and development strategies among all levels of government, establishing cooperation with the private and finance sector and other interest groups, supporting voluntary initiatives and defining safeguards and incentives. The goal of the Group’s work was to facilitate achievable commitments from Parties and other groups, built on best practices and a living platform to address drivers of biodiversity loss, with associated metrics.

24. The Co-Chairs presented their reflections on the process for development of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework (non-paper 01). They listed the consultations that had been held so far, in which they had participated. Thematic issues would be identified at the current meeting, and a first draft would be prepared in a third phase. Further consultations, workshops and studies were planned. The key messages from the consultations were that the framework should be easy to communicate, with a clear link between the 2030 and the 2050 visions; the vision of living in harmony with nature should be expressed in concrete terms; the targets and indicators should be specific, measurable, achievable, realistic and time-bound (SMART); the time targets should be relevant to the issues, which might also differ according to geographical situation; synergies with other conventions should be used for integration; an explicit linkage be made between biodiversity and climate change; and means of implementation should be in place. Planning, reporting and accountability were important, and the framework should build on the existing system, including NBSAPs. The framework should integrate the Cartagena and Nagoya Protocols.

25. The Co-Chairs said that participants had noted that the 2050 Vision should be explicitly linked to the three objectives of the Convention and to the four elements of the 2050 Vision, namely valuing, conserving, restoring and wisely using biodiversity. They had also pointed out that the objectives of sustainable use and benefit-sharing should be better reflected in the new framework. Although some of the targets in the current strategic plan might be relevant for the post-2020 framework, they would have to be reviewed and updated. Participants had also noted that the new framework should have fewer overall targets and that indicators for measuring progress in reaching each target should be developed concurrently, with the necessary data. Although they had agreed that the targets should be ambitious but realistic, some had considered that significant economic and social changes would be required to address the findings of the IPBES assessment, which could threaten the current development model and would have to be addressed through a new (green) mode, while another group had considered that addressing the IPBES assessment should be balanced with socioeconomic development, as there was opposition between growth and the issues that had been identified. They had proposed that the targets be categorized. The first category would contain a few targets directly related to the objectives of the Convention, which would be the object of most communications. It had been widely agreed that it would be difficult to identify a single, quantifiable target similar to the climate change goal of lowering the global temperature by 2 °C. The second category would comprise a larger number of targets for addressing threats and enablers, and the third would comprise targets related to enablers and the resources and elements necessary for reaching other targets.

26. Participants had emphasized that the new framework should strengthen the involvement of IPLCs, women and youth, particularly with regard to implementation. It was understood that coordination and engagement with other conventions would increase the capacity of the new framework to reach their shared goals. Linkages and synergies between biodiversity and climate change should be emphasized. Participants had said that rapid implementation of the framework would be required, and the necessary means should be established to benefit from the lessons learnt from the challenges encountered in implementing the existing framework. The critical enablers for the post-2020 framework were identified as resource mobilization, innovative, accessible financial mechanisms, capacity-building, technology transfer and access, partnerships and mainstreaming. With regard to resource mobilization, participants had agreed that the BIOFIN process should be used to make existing investments more effective and efficient, develop biodiversity finance plans and obtain contributions of non-State actors. They had noted that a separate target might be required for resource mobilization, including identification of complementary financial mechanisms under the GEF (similar to the Green Climate Fund). Tools to facilitate mainstreaming in the framework were identified by participants in various consultations, which included environmental impact assessments, strategic environmental assessments, natural capital accounting, ecosystem assessments, valuation of biodiversity, blue economy and green economy. A number of participants had suggested that legal means could be used, such as creating legally binding requirements at global level or local level, including rights of nature.

27. There had been a clear call for reinforced accountability in the new framework, with greater transparency and more comprehensive planning and reporting systems, strengthening existing compliance mechanisms, establishing more effective monitoring and reviewing NBSAPs as tools for implementation and aligning them to the post-2020 framework.

28. The issue of voluntary commitments had received much attention. The Co-Chairs understood that, while such commitments are useful for the climate change framework, the different geographical scopes of biodiversity could make voluntary commitments less flexible. Participants had considered that voluntary commitments should not be used by Parties to reach biodiversity targets but that they could be useful for non-state actors and for Parties planning to reach more ambitious targets than those agreed to in the new framework.

29. In the ensuing discussion, statements were made by representatives of Argentina, Australia, Bolivia, Brazil, Chile, China, Colombia, Costa Rica, the Democratic Republic of the Congo, Ecuador, Ethiopia, Japan, Peru and Switzerland.

30. Representatives emphasized that, although the new framework should have ambitious but realistic targets, the ambition should be reflected in balanced manner, be flexible and not exceed the scope decided by the Parties. The participation of the private sector should be restricted in order to ensure ambitious goals, while at the same time changing corporate mentalities to include biodiversity considerations. Several speakers raised concern about the limited time available for consultations, such as among governments in some regions. The involvement of biodiversity conventions must be assured, and the active involvement of IPLCs, women and youth. An appeal was made to partners to support developing countries in organizing internal consultations. Specific percentages and timelines should be established. Access and benefit-sharing should also be emphasized. The new framework must be designed to benefit all Parties.

31. A statement was made a representative of the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO).

32. Statements were made on behalf of the 30X30 Ocean Alliance including Conservation International, Campaign for Nature, National Geographic Society, Oceans 5, the Pew Charitable Trusts and Wildlife Conservation Society and International Fund for Animal Welfare on behalf of BirdLife International, Conservation International, Royal Society for Protection of Birds, WWF, Center for Large Landscape Conservation, Greenpeace, Wildlife Conservation Society and The Nature Conservancy.

ITEM 4. POTENTIAL ELEMENTS OF THE STRUCTURE AND SCOPE OF THE POST-2020 GLOBAL BIODIVERSITY FRAMEWORK

33. At the second session of the meeting, on 28 August 2019, the Working Group took up agenda item 4. Under this item, the Working Group had before it a note by the Executive Secretary on potential elements of the structure and scope of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework (CBD/WG2020/1/3), and a non-paper prepared by the Co-Chairs of the Working Group on providing proposal for a possible structure of a post 2020 global biodiversity framework.

34. Statements were made by representatives of Argentina, Australia, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Botswana, Brazil, Cameroon (on behalf of the African Group), China, Colombia, the European Union and its member States, India, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Japan, Jordan, Mexico, Norway, Philippines, Republic of Korea and Switzerland.

35. Statements were also made by representatives of the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO), the International Treaty on Plant Genetic Resources for Food and Agriculture (ITPGRFA), the secretariat of the Carpathian Convention, the secretariat of the Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species of Wild Fauna and Flora (CITES), the secretariat of the Convention on Migratory Species of Wild Animals (CMS), the secretariat of the Ramsar Convention on Wetlands, the United Nations Entity for Gender Equality and the Empowerment of Women (UN Women), the United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP) and the World Bank.

36. In the exchange of views on the vision, scope and content of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework, it was generally agreed that the documents before the Working Group would serve as an appropriate basis for discussions aimed at establishing a common understanding of the issues to be covered within the framework. Among those issues were the elements and blocks proposed by the Co-Chairs as a possible structure, including goals, targets, indicators, implementation instruments and an accountability framework. Views were expressed in favour of building, where relevant, on the Aichi Biodiversity Targets a post-2020 global biodiversity framework that was inspirational, ambitious, well-balanced and comprehensible to all, with an emphasis on the development of specific, measurable, achievable, results-based and time-bound (SMART) targets and sub-targets and the mobilization of resources to match. Another point stressed was that synergies among the Rio conventions in particular should be used to advantage to avoid duplication, with other biodiversity-related conventions furthermore participating in the formulation and implementation of the framework. Emphasis was likewise placed on the need to retain focus on the main objectives of the Convention on Biodiversity by addressing, in the light of the IPBES Global Assessment, the direct and indirect drivers of biodiversity loss in order to achieve the transformative change sought. With the aim of maximizing delivery on that score, guidance on the updating of national biodiversity strategies and action plans (NBSAPs) was similarly underlined, together with guidance on sustainable use of biodiversity and on the way forward to successful implementation of the 2050 Vision for Biodiversity (“Living in harmony with nature”).

37. In addition to the integration of targets relating to access and benefit-sharing and biosafety, an overriding view was that the post-2020 global biodiversity framework should be closely linked with, among others, the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development, the Paris Agreement relating to climate change, and relevant multilateral environmental agreements. Also advocated were measures to strengthen the involvement of all stakeholders in the development and implementation of the framework, among them indigenous peoples and local communities, women, youth, civil society, the private sector and academia. Other matters highlighted for attention included those of mainstreaming across all sectors, the gender and food-security perspectives, sustainable livelihoods, oceans, wetlands, human health and well-being, the many links between agriculture, biodiversity and ecosystem services, and the need for a regular, transparent and open review process.

38. Further statements on the subject were made by representatives of the CBD Women’s Causus, the Global Diversity Information Facility (GBIF), Friends of the Earth International (also on behalf of the Indigenous and Community Conserved Areas (ICCA) Consortium and GBYN), indigenous peoples and local communities), ICLEI and the World Wildlife Fund (WWF).

Cluster 1 – The outcome-oriented elements (vision, mission, goals and targets) of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework

39. At the 3rd session of the meeting, on the morning of 28 August 2019, the Working Group continued its discussion of the item with an exchange of views on matters relating to cluster 1, taking into account the information set out thereon in document CBD/WG2020/1/3.

40. Statements were made by representatives of Argentina, Australia, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Cameroon (on behalf of the African Group), Canada, Chile, China, Colombia, the European Union and its member States, Ireland, Japan, Mexico, New Zealand, Norway, Republic of Korea, Saint Lucia, Switzerland and Uganda.

41. In the exchange of views on cluster 1, participants made several points in addition to those reported by the Co-Chairs from the consultations that had been held. The rationale and principles for the new framework should state that the goals of the two previous strategic plans had not been met and that a new, more ambitious approach was necessary, with new approaches and new thinking on incentives for strengthened conservation, restoration and mainstreaming to address the three objectives of the Convention in a balanced manner. The post-2020 framework should provide solutions to attaining the 2065 Development Agenda for Africa and be aligned with the SDGs. Focus on a 2030 mission that was action-oriented rather than based on the state of biodiversity would permit assessment of successful performance; a further review in 2040 could be considered. Paragraph 7 of non-paper 02 appeared to limit benefit-sharing to the stewards of biodiversity, while benefit-sharing from sustainable use should be included.

42. The framework structure should be lean, with a simple, clear apex goal or mission that was understandable to everyone. The goal or mission should be measurable, and, it should not duplicate those in other multilateral environmental agreements (MEAs). It should also be inspiring and motivating. The three objectives of the Convention and the core elements of Aichi Targets should also be reflected. A layered approach could be considered, in which many targets were linked to different goals. Targets and sub-targets should have clear baselines for monitoring derived from existing work and should include quantitative and qualitative aspects. They must be understandable to all. The framework should account for the direct and indirect drivers of biodiversity loss and promote transformative change.

43. A statement was also made by a representative of the World Bank.

44. A further statement was made by a representative of Friends of the Earth International.

Cluster 2 – Enabling conditions and means of implementation for the post-2020 global biodiversity framework

45. Statements were made by representatives of Argentina, Australia, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Brazil, Cameroon, Chile, China, Colombia, Costa Rica, Cuba, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Ecuador, Egypt, Eswatini, Ethiopia, the European Union and its member States, India, Japan, Kenya (on behalf of the African Group), Iran (Islamic Republic of), Liberia, Mauritania, Mexico, New Zealand, Niger, Norway, Pakistan, Peru, Republic of Korea, Russian Federation, Somalia, South Africa, South Sudan, State of Palestine, Switzerland, Syrian Arab Republic, Uganda and Venezuela.

46. In the exchange of views on cluster 2, participants noted that a coherent approach was required to reduce biodiversity loss, and they emphasized the importance of enabling conditions to ensure implementation, clear obligations for Parties, clear guidelines for long-term capacity-building, technology transfer and resource mobilization. Research, scientific collaboration and knowledge management should be prioritized, including indigenous and traditional knowledge. Clear communication for all stakeholders was an overarching principle or enabler. A comprehensive campaign had been prepared in advance of the Conference of the Parties to the Convention on Biological Diversity in China in 2020 to make society aware of the importance of biodiversity, and biodiversity could be promoted by “ambassadors” and non-state actors. A strong communication strategy was required, with innovative messages. It should send strong, consistent, coherent messages that changed thoughts and practices.

47. Resource mobilization was integral to halting biodiversity loss, as stated in decision 14/22. One participant noted that CBD had received 32% of the funding in the most recent replenishment of the GEF. Three participants commented, however, that GEF funding should not be affected by political pressure but must be based on justice and equality. GEF must be continually strengthened, as it also provided funds to other conventions, and other donors should be sought. Public funding by local governments and the private sector should also be considered, including investment in products, although safeguards against harmful activities and disincentives should be established for non-state funding. An enabling environment should be created, with a legal framework for rights and assets and tax reform. BIOFIN already had a clear view of the cost of national strategies, which could be used as a baseline. Costs could be decreased by phasing out harmful subsidies. The Addis Ababa Declaration cited the co-benefits of biodiversity protection, which would reduce the resources required. The framework should include an analysis of the cost of its implementation and a clear commitment to predictable, coherent funding, ensuring access and benefit-sharing. Clear advice should be provided on resource mobilization and on the mechanisms for access to and transfer of relevant technologies for achieving all three objectives of the CBD, based on those used in the UNFCCC, for compliance with agreements on illicit trade. As capacity-building for resource mobilization was central to all the targets, it should be included in cluster 1. One participant described a transformative approach that accounted for the situation of biodiversity and its contribution to human economy, both globally and locally, with a finance plan that included ecosystem tourism based on BIOFIN that could be part of suite of interventions in the new framework.

48. Statements were also made by representatives of the Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) and World Bank.

49. Further statements were made by representatives of Birdlife International, CBD Women's Caucus, Friends of the Earth International, GYBN, IIFB and Nature Conservancy.

Cluster 3 – Planning and accountability modalities, mechanism and tools (monitoring, reporting, review)

50. Statements were made by representatives of Argentina, Australia, Benin, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Botswana, Burkina Faso, Canada, Chile, China, Colombia, Côte d'Ivoire (on behalf of the African Group), Cuba, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Ecuador, Egypt, Eritrea, Eswatini, Ethiopia, the European Union and its member States, Georgia, Ghana, Indonesia, Japan, Lebanon, Mauritania, Mexico, Namibia, New Zealand, Nigeria, Norway, Philippines, Republic of Moldova, Saint Lucia, Switzerland, Tajikistan, Togo and Uganda.

51. In the exchange of views on cluster 3, participants reiterated that NBSAPs and reports should continue to be the main instruments for implementing the Convention at national level. Participants commented that implementation instruments should be included in all four clusters, as a cross-cutting theme. Some countries had difficulty in implementing NBSAPs without the support of other organizations, and a regional approach might be considered in shared projects to improve biodiversity.

52. NBSAPs should be updated to make them more dynamic and responsive to the new framework. As NBSAPs required substantial resources, however, any changes should be kept to a minimum, and adequate, timely financial support, including from GEF, should be. Periodic or cyclical reviews linked to other intergovernmental processes should be considered, with engagement of all stakeholders in the review process. The format for monitoring and review should be streamlined, perhaps by alignment with reports to other multilateral environmental agreements (MEAs), or multidimensional reporting with voluntary peer review. It was noted that UNEP was developing DART, which was a set of simple indicators harmonized with the SDGs and MEAs, for common monitoring, reporting and peer review, which should ensure that NBSAPs were implementable and linked to the new global framework.

53. Several speakers asked for further clarification of the term “voluntary national commitments”, while voluntary national commitments from non-State actors should be promoted, including from IPLCs and the private sector. Voluntary commitments could allow Parties to take leadership on certain aspects of biodiversity and therefore engender greater political commitment. Such commitments might be made mainly for short-term priorities, and regional commitments might be made, as suggested by IPBES, for shared challenges and synergies among conventions.

54. Accountability could be strengthened by ensuring that indicators were relevant to each country and measurable, reporting was better aligned and regular review mechanisms were strengthened. Global harmonization was needed, with common indicators and a mechanism to track individual commitments. Sovereignty should not, however, be undermined by the inclusion of accountability mechanisms that were not transparent and just. Accountability should be integral to monitoring, assessment, review and planning to enhance implementation. It should account for the origins of harm, which might be external to country and ensure transparency on how finances were sent to developing countries. More research should be conducted on the economics of biodiversity.

55. Statements were also made by representatives of CBD Women's Caucus, Friends of the Earth International, also on behalf of Indigenous Peoples' and Community Conserved Areas and Territories (ICCA) Consortium, World Animal Net, Natural Justice, Action Group on Erosion, Technology and Concentration (ETC), CBD Alliance, GYBN, IIFB, United Nations University and UN Women.

Cluster 4 – Cross-cutting approaches and issues

56. At the 4th session of the meeting, on the afternoon of 28 August 2019, the Working Group continued its discussion of the item with an exchange of views on matters relating to cluster 4, taking into account the information set out thereon in document CBD/WG2020/1/3.

57. Statements were made by representatives of Argentina, Australia, Belarus, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Cameroon, Canada, the Central African Republic, Chad (on behalf of the African Group), Chile, China, Colombia, Côte d'Ivoire, Ecuador, Ethiopia, the European Union and its member States, Ghana, Grenada, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), New Zealand, Malaysia, Mexico, Namibia, Nigeria, Norway, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Switzerland, Togo and Uganda.

58. A statement was also made by a representative of the World Bank.

59. In the exchange of views, the mainstreaming of biodiversity as a cross-cutting issue was seen as pivotal to the post-2020 global biodiversity framework, with national capital accounting highlighted as a development planning tool that would benefit local communities in particular. The need for related training and capacity-building was therefore emphasized, together with such other matters as a focus on education for all, a bottom-up approach, an overarching communication strategy, greener consumption patterns and the development of appropriate indicators and specific targets. NBSAPs were also deemed key, however, meaning that mainstreaming should be additionally considered under implementation instruments. It should furthermore be guided by the work of the Informal Advisory Group on Mainstreaming of Biodiversity and be expanded to other economic sectors. Strategic partnerships, including with business, industry, academia, cities and local and subnational governments, were likewise viewed as fundamental to the development and implementation of the framework. The Sharm El-Sheikh to Kunming Action Agenda for Nature and People and voluntary commitments were also mentioned as key tools for encouraging the involvement of numerous stakeholders, which would necessitate further guidance concerning effective actions and successful outcomes.

60. The roles and responsibilities of all actors in the development and implementation of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework should be clearly specified and planning cycles synchronized with those of all biodiversity-related conventions. Synergies must be built with those conventions and with relevant multilateral environmental agreements, in which context a cooperative approach was key, taking into account in addition United Nations bodies and processes, such as the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development, including so as to prevent the duplication of efforts. The Environmental Management Group was well-placed to enhance United Nations involvement in the development and implementation of the framework.

61. The post-2020 global biodiversity framework should moreover be drafted so as to promote its understanding and implementation by indigenous peoples and local communities, who were the guardians of biodiversity and whose active participation alongside all other stakeholders in the implementation of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework was critical to success. For their part, women and girls should benefit equally with others from biodiversity and ecosystem services, to which end relevant

indicators should be developed. Given their traditional knowledge concerning the use of biodiversity resources, rural women had a vital part to play in the implementation of the framework, which must also take into account gender equality and intergenerational equity. As to youth, they were important inspirational agents, active managers of change and developers of innovative solutions, which demanded the integration of their perspective into framework, especially as it was they who faced the consequences of current actions.

62. Further statements on the subject were made by representatives of Friends of the Earth International (also on behalf of La Via Campesina and the International Planning Committee for Food Sovereignty), GYBN, the International Collective in Support of Fisheries (ICSF) (also on behalf of Masifundise and the Traditional Fisherfold Union of Indonesia), the ICCA Consortium (also on behalf of ActionAid International, the Forest Peoples Programme, Friends of the Earth International, Natural Justice and the World Animal Net), IIFB, the Nature Conservancy (also on behalf of Birdlife International and Conservation International), the United Nations University Institute for the Advanced Study of Sustainability (UNU-IAS) and World Animal Net (also on behalf of Compassion in World Farming and the Born Free Foundation).

63. A representative of the Secretariat then briefed to the Working Group on the process proposed for development of the resource mobilization component of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework, noting that a panel of experts was being constituted, thanks to financial support from the Government of Germany, in order to prepare relevant analyses and reports on the subject for consideration by the Working Group. He further noted, inter alia, that the Government of Germany had also expressed its willingness to fund and host, in early 2020, a thematic consultative workshop on resource mobilization, the aim of which was to provide further input to the work of the expert panel.

64. The Working Group then agreed to establish a discussion group on the vision, mission, goals and targets of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework, with Ms. Charlotta Sorqvist (Sweden) and Mr. Dilosharvo Dustov (Tajikistan) as its co-Chairs, the group was mandated to work towards a broad and common understanding of those particular elements of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework.

ITEM 5. FUTURE WORK PROGRAMME OF THE WORKING GROUP AND ALLOCATION OF TASKS TO OTHER INTERSESSIONAL BODIES AND PROCESSES

65. At the fifth session of the meeting, on the morning of 29 August 2019, the Working Group took up agenda item 5. Under this item, the Working Group had before it a note by the Executive Secretary on future work programme of the Open-ended Working Group and allocation of tasks to other intersessional bodies and processes (CBD/WG2020/1/4), which also contained a suggested conclusion for possible adoption by the Working Group. Annexed to the note was a table showing the possible allocation of tasks to other bodies and processes for the development of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework.

66. Statements were made by representatives of Australia, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Cameroon, China, Colombia, Egypt, Eswatini (on behalf of the African Group), Ethiopia, the European Union and its member States, Ghana, Japan, Indonesia, Mauritania, Mexico, Nigeria, Norway, Peru, Sierra Leone, South Africa, Switzerland, Uganda and Yemen.

67. Statements were also made by representatives of the CITES secretariat, the CMS secretariat, the secretariat of the Ramsar Convention and UN Women.

68. In the ensuing discussion of the future work programme of the Working Group, a range of issues was broached, including but not limited to: the importance of a balanced approach and of the timely consideration of specific matters in an inclusive, transparent and participatory process; the preparations for and expected outcomes of the next meetings of the Working Group and the volume of work to be completed within the related time frame; synergies and connectivity; inputs to the process, including from non-biodiversity-related sources, and cooperative engagement with key actors therein; taxonomic information and its linkage with digital sequence information; implementation and accountability; resource mobilization; national voluntary targets; gender-responsiveness; and the conduct of discussions

within the framework of subsidiary bodies of the Convention on Biological Diversity. Various amendments to the suggested conclusion were also proposed.

69. Further statements were made by representatives of the CBD Women's Caucus, GYBN, the ICCA Consortium (also on behalf of ActionAid International, the Born Free Foundation, Compassion in World Farming, Friends of the Earth International, the International Collective in Support of Fishworkers, the International University Network on Cultural and Biological Diversity (IUNCBD), the Institute for Biodiversity Network, Natural Justice and World Animal Net), ICLEI, IIFB, IUCN, Natural Justice (also on behalf of the Malindi Rights Forum, the Forest Peoples Programme and Friends of the Earth International) and WWF.

70. The Co-Chairs then said that, taking into account the views expressed during the discussion of the item, they would prepare a conference room paper for the consideration of the Working Group.

ITEM 6. OTHER MATTERS

71. [to be completed]

ITEM 7. ADOPTION OF THE REPORT

72. The present report was adopted at the [to be completed] session of the meeting on [to be completed], on the basis of the draft report presented by the Rapporteur (CBD/WG2020/1/L.1).

ITEM 8. CLOSURE OF THE MEETING

73. After the customary exchange of courtesies, the Chair declared the first meeting of the Working Group closed at [to be completed] on [to be completed].

Annex

SYNTHESIS OF VIEWS EXPRESSED ON THE CLUSTERS ADDRESSED UNDER AGENDA ITEM 4

Cluster 1 - The outcome-oriented elements (vision, mission, goals, and targets) of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework

Cluster 2 - Enabling conditions and means of implementation for the post-2020 global biodiversity framework

Cluster 3 – Planning and accountability modalities, mechanisms and tools (monitoring, reporting, review)

Cluster 4 – Cross-cutting approaches and issues

[to be completed]