



Convention on Biological Diversity

Distr.
GENERAL

CBD/POST2020/WS/2019/4/2
21 June 2019

ORIGINAL: ENGLISH

REPORT OF THE REGIONAL CONSULTATION ON THE POST-2020 GLOBAL BIODIVERSITY FRAMEWORK FOR CENTRAL AND EASTERN EUROPE, BELGRADE, 16-18 APRIL 2019

I. INTRODUCTION

1. The Conference of the Parties to the Convention on Biological Diversity, at its fourteenth meeting, adopted decision [14/34](#) on the preparatory process for the development of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework and requested the Executive Secretary to facilitate the implementation of the process. In order to support the preparation of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework, an open-ended intersessional working group was established, and Mr. Francis Ogwal (Uganda) and Mr. Basile van Havre (Canada) were designated as its co-chairs.
2. In decision 14/34, paragraph 6, the Conference of the Parties urged Parties and invited other Governments and stakeholders to “actively engage and contribute to the process of developing a robust post-2020 global biodiversity framework in order to foster strong ownership of the framework to be agreed and strong support for its immediate implementation”. Therefore, it was agreed that regional and thematic consultation workshops would be held as a platform for the discussions.
3. The Regional Consultation on the Post-2020 Global Biodiversity Framework for Central and Eastern Europe was held in Belgrade from 16 to 18 April 2019. The Consultation was organized by the Secretariat of the Convention on Biological Diversity, with the generous support and collaboration of the [Ministry of Environmental Protection of Serbia](#) and the [United Nations Development Programme](#) (UNDP), [Serbia office](#), as well as the generous support of the Government of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland and the Government of Japan, and under the guidance of the Co-Chairs of the Open-ended Working Group. The Consultation was conducted in English and Russian, with sessions in plenary and break-out groups.
4. The Consultation was attended by experts from Belarus, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Bulgaria, Croatia, Czechia, Estonia, Georgia, Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, North Macedonia, Moldova, Poland, Romania, Serbia, Tajikistan, Turkmenistan, Ukraine, Centre for Support of Indigenous Peoples of the North (CSIPN/RITC), Baikal Buryat Center for Indigenous Cultures, Forest Peoples Programme, Global Youth Biodiversity Network (GYBN), Ecological Movement “BIOM”, United Nations Environment Programme, United Nations Environment Programme/Tehran Convention Interim Secretariat, United Nations Environment Programme–World Conservation Monitoring Centre (UNEP-WCMC), United Nations Development Programme (UNDP), Deutsche Gesellschaft für Internationale Zusammenarbeit (GIZ), Friends of the Earth, General Fisheries Commission for the Mediterranean, Intergovernmental Science-Policy Platform on Biodiversity and Ecosystem Services (IPBES), International Union for Conservation of Nature (IUCN), Montenegrin Ecologists Society, [WWF Adria](#) and [WWF Russia](#).¹

¹ The list of participants in the workshop is accessible from:
<https://www.cbd.int/doc/c/ebb9/cd50/38053df3d09794dffbf5d165/post2020-ws-2019-04-list-participants-en.pdf>

ITEM I. OPENING STATEMENTS

5. The Consultation was opened on 16 April by Ms. Cristiana Paşca Palmer, Executive Secretary of the Convention on Biological Diversity, who delivered opening remarks via a videotaped message. In her remarks, she thanked the Ministry of Environmental Protection for hosting and UNDP for co-organizing the Consultation. She noted that the Conference of the Parties to the Convention on Biological Diversity at its fourteenth meeting had formally had set in motion the preparatory process for crafting a post-2020 global biodiversity framework and that the Consultation would be one of several regional and thematic consultations in which Parties and other stakeholders would deliberate on the successes and challenges of collective efforts to safeguard nature within the framework of the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020, and to provide inputs for an ambitious but solid way forward. She noted that three regional consultations (for Asia and the Pacific, Western Europe and Africa) had recently been held, and that a fifth one, for the Latin American and Caribbean region, would be held the following month. She outlined the road map that would lead from the fourteenth meeting of the Conference of the Parties to the meetings of the open-ended intersessional working group, the release of an initial discussion document, the five regional consultations and the thematic consultations as well as an updated discussion document. In closing, she emphasized that the output of the current and other consultations would set the stage for collective efforts in the coming decades, which would, in turn, determine success or failure to ensure that life on Earth is safeguarded, leading the way to a brighter future for all.

6. Mrs. Steliana Nedera, UNDP Resident Representative, Country Office for Serbia, also delivered opening remarks. She noted that UNDP had been dedicated for many years to the conservation of biodiversity, which represented a large part of its portfolio of 400 projects in 130 countries, with support from the Global Environment Facility (GEF) and other donors. She noted that UNDP was the operational arm and developmental partner of countries for supporting biodiversity, and she noted that UNDP was changing its way of working. Informed by the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development, UNDP was working together with different stakeholders, through strong partnerships that were even more inclusive and diverse than in the past. Furthermore, she noted the call for integrated solutions, in recognition of the fact that working in silos was not producing desired impacts. She also noted the call for transformation and the need to find solutions and approaches that would take into account all facets of an issue. She informed participants that the work of UNDP in Serbia included working closely with the Ministry of Environmental Protection to support the development of the country's biodiversity strategy and integration of conservation principles into policies, as well as on addressing the impacts of climate change, the impacts of human activity, and addressing the need to increase the resilience of the natural resources of Serbia into the future. She explained that the future called for an integrated approach and strong partnerships, using innovation, creativity and cooperation to guide us. She explained that UNDP worked in partnership with governments, communities and civil society groups at all levels, as well as United Nations agencies, GEF and donor partners, the World Bank and development banks, research and science organizations, and the private sector. In closing, she said that she looked forward to the outcomes of the present Consultation and wished participants the best of luck.

7. His Excellency, Mr. Goran Trivan, Minister of Environmental Protection, welcomed participants to Serbia. He expressed deep concern about the state of the environment, in particular the loss of biodiversity and climate change, and his determination to find solutions for Serbia. He noted that, while many goals had been reached in the preceding 20 years, those problems persisted. He also expressed his belief that every individual the world over could also make a difference, noting that the will to make a change was paramount, beyond even the availability of resources. He expressed his intention to begin by planting trees, including 700 hectares in Belgrade. He asked participants to treat their own country as if it were the planet, and to consider that, if biodiversity vanished, human beings would be forever changed. In closing, he thanked everyone for attending the Consultation and expressed his country's willingness to do what is necessary to facilitate that process.

ITEM 2. INTRODUCTION AND PURPOSE OF THE CONSULTATION

8. Under this agenda item, the Co-Chairs of the Open-ended Working Group on the Post-2020 Global Biodiversity Framework, Mr. Francis Ogwal (Uganda) and Mr. Basile van Havre (Canada), delivered a presentation outlining the process for developing the post-2020 global biodiversity framework. They explained the contents of Conference of the Parties decision 14/34, in which the process for the preparation of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework had been adopted, and confirmed their commitment to ensuring that the post-2020 process adhered to the principles enshrined in the decision. They noted that the process for developing the post-2020 global biodiversity framework would have three phases: (a) the first to collect views from the regions through five regional consultations, as well as the Trondheim Conference and the first meeting of the Open-ended Working Group; (b) the second to undertake thematic consultations and to convene two further meetings of the Open-ended Working Group; and (c) the third to bring those elements together into a zero draft of the framework, to be ready for the meeting of the Open-ended Working Group in July 2019. They conveyed some key messages that had emerged from previous consultations, noted some key dates to come in the process and outlined the roles and responsibilities of everyone involved, stressing that the Co-Chairs were there to listen and to remain impartial. In concluding, they noted that the purpose of the regional consultations was not about coming to agreed conclusions but, rather, to identify issues and to begin exchanging views.

9. Following that presentation, Mr. Alexander Shestakov (Secretariat) provided an overview of the agenda, explained the process for the Consultation and outlined the expectations. He then introduced Ms. Victoria Elias (WWF Russia), who would serve as the facilitator for the Consultation.

ITEM 3. ORGANIZATION OF WORK, ELECTION OF CO-CHAIRS AND SELF-INTRODUCTION OF PARTICIPANTS

10. Participants decided that Ms. Jelena Ducic (Serbia) and Ms. Shirin B. Karryyeva (Turkmenistan) would serve as co-chairs for the Consultation. Ms. Galina Mozgova was nominated and approved to serve as the rapporteur. Participants then briefly introduced themselves.

ITEM 4. CURRENT STATE OF AFFAIRS AND FUTURE TRENDS

11. This session addressed the current state of biodiversity in the region and possible future trends.

12. Ms. Marine Elbakidze ([Swedish University of Agricultural Sciences](#)) provided an overview of the [Regional Assessment Report on Biodiversity and Ecosystem Services for Europe and Central Asia](#), undertaken by IPBES. She noted that the biodiversity of the region was steadily declining. Freshwater species and inland surface water habitats were particularly threatened, as were marine habitats and species, and terrestrial species and habitats. She pointed to three main policy areas that offered hope for the future: (a) mainstreaming the conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity into the policies, plans, programmes, strategies and practices of public and private actors, which could be achieved with more proactive, focused and goal-oriented environmental action, including quantitative goals; (b) developing integrated approaches across sectors, which would enable more systematic consideration of biodiversity by public and private decision makers, with ecological fiscal reforms providing an integrated set of incentives to support the shift to sustainable development; and (c) participation of a wide range of actors and stakeholders who are increasingly integrated into governance processes, which could have a positive effect on biodiversity if the effectiveness, efficiency and equity implications of such integration were carefully monitored, evaluated and improved.

13. Ms. Ducic delivered a presentation on behalf of the Biodiversity Task Force of South East Europe, the technical and advisory body of the [Regional Working Group on Environment](#). She addressed the issue of how regional cooperation mechanisms and knowledge-based initiatives could benefit the post-2020 dialogue, including the following points: (a) the need to develop quantifiable and attainable targets; (b) the importance of mainstreaming biodiversity conservation in development planning (implementation of the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development) and sectoral planning (forestry, water management, agriculture, etc.); (c) the need to ensure more sustainable funding for implementing the

post-2020 framework; (d) the importance of showing the public the benefits and economic returns of biodiversity conservation; (e) the need to build capacities on diagnosis, development of responses and implementation of sustainable biodiversity finance solutions; (f) the necessity of resource mobilization; (g) the potential to secure new funding sources from public and private actors; (h) the reduction of implementation costs by reducing the drivers of conservation costs; and (i) the potential from addressing adverse and harmful impacts on biodiversity more decisively.

14. Mr. Shestakov provided an overview of the process to prepare the fifth edition of the *Global Biodiversity Outlook*. He also provided information on the current status of submission of the sixth national reports and encouraged Parties that had not yet done so to submit their reports as soon as possible. The sixth national reports were an important source of information for the development of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework and the fifth edition of the *Global Biodiversity Outlook*. The reports spelled out what actions countries had taken, what their successes had been and what challenges and obstacles they had encountered. Thus, the reports provided useful information for assessing the implementation of the Convention and developing a new framework. While the rate of submission of the national reports had been comparable to previous rounds of national reports, the rate needed to be significantly increased. He encouraged all participants to ensure that their country's sixth national reports were submitted as soon as possible. Work had already started on the fifth edition of the *Global Biodiversity Outlook*, and an information document with a tentative outline had been issued.² He encouraged Parties to share their views on that outline and/or relevant examples or information.

ITEM 5. OPPORTUNITIES AND CHALLENGES DURING THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE STRATEGIC PLAN FOR BIODIVERSITY 2011-2020 AND INSIGHTS FOR THE POST-2020 GLOBAL BIODIVERSITY FRAMEWORK

15. During this session, participants were asked: (a) to identify the opportunities for and challenges to enhanced implementation of the Convention in the region and to reflect on how a post-2020 global biodiversity framework could respond to these opportunities and challenges; and (b) to reflect on how the structure, contents and political positioning of the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020 has (or has not) facilitated their work on the implementation of the Convention at the national level. The participants broke into four small discussion groups; each group provided a report to the plenary. A summary of the discussion points is available in annex II.

ITEM 6. DEVELOPING THE 2050 VISION OF LIVING IN HARMONY WITH NATURE AND THE 2030 MISSION

16. Under this item, the Co-Chairs of the Open-Ended Working Group introduced the discussion document on the post-2020 global biodiversity framework ([CBD/POST2020/PREP/1/1](https://www.cbd.int/doc/c/30b5/c51a/dca208d1171a0ec83bad458d/gbo5-01-01-en.pdf)) to provide the participants with an opportunity to reflect on its contents and to recommend consideration of any additional issues considered important to the region which had not yet been included.³ In their presentation, the Co-Chairs summarized decisions and recommendations adopted by the decision-making and subsidiary bodies of the Convention and its Protocols relevant to the development of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework, and summarized the submissions received thus far on the scope and content of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework.

17. Participants were reminded that, in decision 14/2, the Conference of the Parties had concluded that the 2050 Vision of the Strategic Plan, "Living in harmony with nature", remained relevant, and noted that it should be considered in the post-2020 global biodiversity framework.

18. Two questions from the above-referenced document were then introduced, and participants broke into four small groups to discuss them. Following their discussions, each group provided a report to the plenary. The questions, and a summary of the reports, are provided in annex III.

² See <https://www.cbd.int/doc/c/30b5/c51a/dca208d1171a0ec83bad458d/gbo5-01-01-en.pdf>

³ The presentation is accessible from <https://www.cbd.int/doc/c/3066/5a44/a4519075cc314e0587acfa5/post2020-ws-2019-01-presentation-co-chairs-01-en.pdf>

ITEM 7. OUT-OF-THE-BOX THINKING AND TOOLS FOR AN AMBITIOUS POST-2020 GLOBAL FRAMEWORK

19. The purpose of this item was to stimulate a discussion on the meaning of the 2050 Vision of “living in harmony with nature”, and the changes and actions that would be necessary to realize that vision. Participants were invited to provide thoughts and input on how they saw the state of biodiversity in 2050 and what the mission of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework to 2030 should consist of, and to reflect on the elements and content of an actionable mission statement and the outcomes of a transformative change in the countries of the region.

20. In order to stimulate a discussion on introducing new ideas, thoughts and potential tools to the post-2020 global biodiversity framework, thoughts about what the state of biodiversity might look like in 2050, and ideas for transformative change, participants were encouraged to write their most interesting, “out-of-the-box” ideas and suggestions down on cards.

21. A summary of the output under this item is provided in annex IV.

ITEM 8. INTEGRATING DIVERSE PERSPECTIVES

22. Under this item, participants heard the perspectives of various stakeholder groups as to how their interests should be reflected in the post-2020 global biodiversity framework and its eventual implementation. They also discussed how actions by various stakeholders could be facilitated or enhanced.

23. Mrs. Kuluipa Akmatova (Baikal Buryat Center for Indigenous Cultures) and Mrs. Polina Shulbaeva (Center for Support of Indigenous Peoples of the North) gave a presentation, with input from Mr. Zsolt Molnár (Forest Peoples Programme), entitled “Vision of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework from indigenous peoples and local communities of Central, Eastern Europe and Central Asia”.

24. Mrs. Anastasiia Sakharova (CBD Women’s Caucus) gave a presentation entitled “Gender-responsive framework of CBD”.

25. Mr. Tomáš Baďura ([Global Youth Biodiversity Network](#)) delivered a presentation entitled “Youth perspectives on the post-2020 global biodiversity framework”.

26. Mr. Mateusz Benko ([Tehran Convention Interim Secretariat](#)) delivered a presentation on the Regional Seas Programme.

27. Mr. Ahmed Siliman ([General Fisheries Commission for the Mediterranean](#)) delivered a presentation outlining the experience of the General Fisheries Commission for the Mediterranean.

28. Summaries of these presentations are available in annex I.

ITEM 9. ELEMENTS OF A POST-2020 FRAMEWORK

29. Under this item, participants separated into four groups, comprising representatives of both Parties and organizations, to consider possible key elements of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework. Each group considered the following four topics, and a facilitator for each group then reported back to the plenary:⁴

- (a) Structure and principles of organization of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework;
- (b) Mainstreaming/integration of CBD protocols, multilateral environmental agreements (MEAs) and other relevant processes;
- (c) Resource mobilization/voluntary commitments and contributions;

⁴ The questions considered under each topic can be found here: <https://www.cbd.int/doc/c/4928/c935/012ba93db6bdd568829371a6/post2020-ws-2019-04-questions-01-en.pdf>.

(d) Implementation and national biodiversity strategies and action plans (NBSAPs)/new mechanisms for accountability and review processes.

30. Outputs of the discussion on each topic are reported in annex V.

31. At the end of the day, participants were asked for feedback regarding the output of the discussions that had taken place thus far. Among the various points to emerge, the following two issues or gaps were identified as key areas warranting further discussion:

- (a) Involvement of others (other sectors, stakeholders, actors);
- (b) Synergies (CBD Protocols, Aarhus Convention, other MEAs, Rio conventions).

The following day, participants were divided into two groups to further discuss those issues. The output of the group discussion is reported in annex VI.

ITEM 10. TECHNICAL AND SCIENTIFIC COOPERATION

32. Under this agenda item, participants were invited to discuss how technical and scientific cooperation should be approached and improved to support the post-2020 global biodiversity framework. The Secretariat introduced the item and proposed the following questions for discussion in plenary:

- (a) What are the key scientific and technical needs related to the implementation of post-2020 framework?
- (b) Are there any new or emerging needs?
- (c) What are the features and elements of an effective technical and scientific programme to address needs under the Convention and its Protocols?
- (d) To what extent would you be open to a model that prioritizes the delivery of services (i.e., no transfer of funds) to address your core needs, as opposed to the provision of direct funding?
- (e) At which level is technical and scientific cooperation most impactful: global, regional, subregional?
- (f) Should there be a prioritization of specific types of cooperation?
- (g) How can current technical and scientific cooperation programmes, such as the Bio-Bridge Initiative, the Global Taxonomy Initiative and the Forest Ecosystem Restoration Initiative, be strengthened?

33. The main points emerging from this discussion are reported in annex VII.

ITEM 11. CAPACITY-BUILDING

34. Under this item, participants were invited to discuss how capacity-building and knowledge management should be approached and improved to support the post-2020 global biodiversity framework. The following questions were posed to the plenary for discussion:

- (a) What have been the major limitations to capacity-building over the last 10 years?
- (b) What should be done to improve capacity-building during the post-2020 period?
- (c) What are main lessons learned (what worked well and what did not), and how should these be reflected in the post-2020 framework?
- (d) How should the post-2020 global biodiversity framework address capacity-building, and what implications does this have for the scope and content of the framework?

35. The output of the plenary discussion of these questions is reported in annex VIII.

ITEM 12. SHAPING A NEW NARRATIVE FOR BIODIVERSITY, COMMUNICATION AND OUTREACH

36. To introduce this item, Mr. Johan Hedlund (CBD Secretariat) delivered a presentation entitled “Shaping and communicating new narratives for biodiversity”. He emphasized that engaging in active communication, raising the media profile of biodiversity and enhancing public awareness about biodiversity were key priorities for the CBD Secretariat. He emphasized that a coherent communications plan was needed for the post-2020 global biodiversity process, with clear and consistent messaging across Parties and stakeholders. The messaging needed to be science-based, comprehensible and linked to the sustainable development agenda and other global priorities. Importantly, the plan must create new narratives and resonate with people. It was especially critical that the plan should be linked to peoples’ priorities and daily concerns, including food, health, climate and livelihoods. It must also emphasize that biodiversity loss and climate change were both top priorities and must be tackled together. Furthermore, the economic and social value of biodiversity needed to be fully communicated. To further its communication outreach, the CBD Secretariat was using new technologies and platforms, testing innovative approaches, developing new types of partners and partnerships, enhancing its social media coverage and redesigning its website. The Secretariat maintained a high profile on social media through Facebook, LinkedIn, Twitter and Instagram, enabling it to empower new voices and actors to contribute to the biodiversity agenda.

37. Following his presentation, Mr. Hedlund submitted for discussion in plenary the following list of questions, focusing on how the post-2020 global biodiversity framework should address issues related to communication and awareness in the light of previous experience with awareness-raising on biodiversity:

- (a) How can we best support our focal points in their communication efforts?
- (b) Would a quarterly newsletter highlighting Secretariat activities be a useful tool?
- (c) What needs to be different in order to raise biodiversity awareness to support implementation of the post 2020 framework and enable transformational change?
- (d) How do you think the post-2020 framework, its design, content and messages could help?
- (e) What messages would you like to hear about biodiversity?
- (f) What messages would resonate with people in your region?
- (g) What visuals would help?
- (h) How do you see the role of social media and other tools?

38. A summary of the ensuing discussion is available in annex IX.

ITEM 13. WRAP-UP AND CLOSURE OF THE CONSULTATION

39. Under this item, short presentations were provided by [Friends of the Earth](#) and WWF Adria.

40. Mr. Ogwal and Mr. van Havre, Co-Chairs of the Open-ended Working Group, reflected on the Regional Consultation and noted the following main points emerging from the discussion:

- (a) Valuation of nature and making the economic case for biodiversity are important factors to convince governments in this region;
- (b) Science capacity in this region is strong and differs from that of some other regions;
- (c) Links should be made between the various multilateral agreements;
- (d) This region faces particular challenges in terms of resources;
- (e) Natural capital is an important aspect to be discussed;

(f) Voluntary commitments should be discussed more fully and clearly understood;

(g) Mainstreaming is a term which is difficult to translate into languages in the region, and little has thus far been achieved to operationalize this approach.

41. The Co-Chairs of the Open-ended Working Group then outlined the next steps in the process for developing the post-2020 global biodiversity framework, and participants shared their reflections on the outcomes of the Consultation. Following closing remarks by Mr. Shestakov (Secretariat) and Ms. Ducic (Serbia), the Consultation came to a close.

Annex I

INTEGRATING DIVERSE PERSPECTIVES: SUMMARY OF PRESENTATIONS

“Vision of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework from indigenous peoples and local communities of Central, Eastern Europe and Central Asia”

By Kuluipa Akmatova (Baikal Buryat Center for Indigenous Cultures), Polina Shulbaeva (Center for Support of Indigenous Peoples of the North), and Zsolt Molnár (Forest Peoples Programme)

The representatives of indigenous peoples and local communities presented their vision of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework for their communities in the region, noting that traditional management methods and related traditional knowledge are widespread in the Central and Eastern European region. They emphasized that the post-2020 framework should focus not just on biodiversity but on global ties between biological and cultural diversity, and that the new structural framework must include the participation of all sectors in shaping the future of nature and the environment; additionally, it must include culture as a transformational element of living in harmony with nature. It is important to study the experience of IPBES and apply its approach to different knowledge systems. They highlighted the need for the post-2020 framework to be consistent with the Sustainable Development Goals, human rights instruments, climate change commitments, culture and knowledge, health care, food supply and agriculture, science, education and other relevant sectors, and that the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples must become one of the main legal frameworks for the achievement of the objectives of the Convention on Biological Diversity. They noted the importance of strengthening the [Communication, Education and Public Awareness programme](#). They emphasized the importance of mainstreaming the perspectives of indigenous peoples and local communities and their participation in the overall agenda of the Convention, and the establishment of a permanent subsidiary body that would channel the perspectives of indigenous peoples and local communities to the Conference of the Parties. In conclusion, they indicated that indigenous peoples and local communities must act as main partners/participants in the post-2020 framework and must be represented from every region.

“Gender-responsive framework of CBD”

By Anastasiia Sakharova, CBD Women’s Caucus

Ms. Sakharova began by introducing the [Gender Plan of Action](#), whose adoption by the Conference of the Parties to the Convention on Biological Diversity had been a major achievement. The four objectives of the Plan, namely mainstreaming a gender perspective; promoting of gender equality; demonstrating the benefits of integrating gender; and increasing the effectiveness of implementation efforts, are implemented through policy, organizational, delivery and constituency actions. She noted that the integration of gender considerations in the process of biodiversity conservation would achieve more sustainable and effective results. Gender needs to be reflected in all goals in related to the post-2020 global biodiversity framework, including in planning, targets, indicators and budgets. Ms. Sakharova concluded with the following recommendations for the post-2020 global biodiversity framework:

- (a) The new framework should consider women as actors of transformation, not as service recipients or as a vulnerable group;
- (b) Gender aspects should be reflected in a minimum of 50 per cent of the post-2020 targets for the conservation and sustainable use of biological diversity (as targets, actions, planning, indicators and budgets);
- (c) Gender balance must be ensured at all levels of decision-making. A key objective for 2050 is to achieve gender parity at all levels of decision-making (Indicator: not more than 70 per cent of representatives of one gender in any decision-making authority);
- (d) Conservation of wild natural ecosystems is important. These systems are regulators of conditions of life on Earth. This is important for both men and women.

“Youth perspectives on the post-2020 global biodiversity framework”
By Tomáš Baďura (Global Youth Biodiversity Network)

The presentation highlighted that the reasons for the lack of implementation in the period 2011-2020 and lessons learned from this should form the basis of post-2020 agenda. It proposed to concentrate on actionable plans shorter than 10 years (e.g., 5 years), which would be long enough to stimulate specific action, but not too long to postpone it. Incorporating the diverse values of biodiversity in accounting and decision systems will be crucial and is closely linked with the importance of biodiversity mainstreaming. Cross-institutional bodies, such as the [Natural Capital Committee](#) in the United Kingdom, could be important vehicles for enabling this nationally. Education that helps to reconnect (not only young) people to nature is essential, as is a targeted communication strategy. In the next 10 years, youth will be faced with the consequences of the (in)actions of Parties and thus desire strong and urgent action in post-2020 period. However, young people also recognize their potential role in the implementation of the Convention on Biological Diversity and commit to playing a more active role.

“The perspective of the Regional Seas Programme”
By Mateusz Benko, Tehran Convention Interim Secretariat)

Mr. Benko explained that the UN Environment’s [Regional Seas Programme](#) encompassed 18 regional seas conventions and action plans around the world. It is an action-oriented programme that implements region-specific activities, bringing together stakeholders that include governments, scientific communities and civil society. These multilateral environmental agreements are governed by their Contracting Parties. The Regional Seas Programme intends to produce a document that summarizes the lessons learned from implementation of the [Aichi Biodiversity Targets](#). In this connection, a global report on marine protected areas will be launched in 2020 at the [United Nations Ocean Conference](#) and presented later that year at the 15th meeting of the Conference of the Parties to the Convention on Biological Diversity as a contribution of the Regional Seas on the biodiversity framework.

“Integrating diverse perspectives: Experience of the GFCM”
By Ahmed Siliman, General Fisheries Commission for the Mediterranean

Mr. Siliman presented the strategic activities of the General Fisheries Commission for the Mediterranean (GFCM), which provided some lessons learned on the implementation of Aichi Biodiversity Targets 6 and 11 in the Mediterranean and the Black Sea, in the context of the Mid-Term Strategy. In particular, focus was given to the key results of the [Fish Forum 2018](#) (Rome, 10-14 December 2018), and its link to the post-2020 global framework. He explained that, although the Fish Forum was a fisheries platform for discussion among scientists and experts from research institutes, international organizations and civil society, intersectoral aspects should be taken into consideration for the development of the post-2020 global framework. The key conclusions to be considered relate to (a) the simultaneous management of diverse environmental and anthropogenic issues other than fisheries (e.g., climate change, pollution, eutrophication, mining, invasive species); (b) the enhancement of GFCM cooperation through international agreements (Convention on Biological Diversity and Intergovernmental Oceanographic Commission of the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization); (c) ocean acidification and ocean warming; (d) marine litter; (e) socio-economic issues and new technologies for data collection and traceability regarding illegal, unreported and unregulated (IUU) fishing. Finally, the importance of awareness, capacity-building and education as the main elements to support the post-2020 global framework was underlined. In addition, Mr. Siliman indicated that GFCM was currently undergoing a performance review for the preparation of its post-2020 strategy and was ready to cooperate and share the information for the next steps of the process with the Convention on Biological Diversity.

Annex II

**OPPORTUNITIES AND CHALLENGES DURING THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE
STRATEGIC PLAN FOR BIODIVERSITY 2011-2020 AND INSIGHTS FOR THE
POST-2020 GLOBAL FRAMEWORK**

I. Participants were asked to identify opportunities and challenges for enhanced implementation of the Convention in their region and to reflect on how a post-2020 global biodiversity framework could respond to these opportunities and challenges.

1. The opportunities identified included:

(a) The production of NBSAPs and national reports, which have become a platform for knowledge- and awareness-raising, places political pressure on governments to develop necessary legal and regulatory frameworks and provide support for activities related to biodiversity;

(b) The existence of global biodiversity targets helps to influence national and regional policies;

(c) Being Party to international agreements/conventions encourages governments to pay more attention to the development of strategies aimed at fulfilling their obligations under these agreements and the mobilization of necessary resources;

(d) Introduction of new terms (e.g., ecosystem services) that help to link to other sectors, yet with a need to develop knowledge and capacity;

(e) Increased participation, involvement and awareness-raising among various sectors (multi-stakeholder approach): governmental, scientific institutions, national and local governments, non-governmental organizations, private sector, general public/local communities;

(f) Increased mobilization of resources and access to financial mechanisms, with the appearance of new donors and easier access to GEF funds;

(g) Increased synergies with other conventions, opportunities for mainstreaming biodiversity into other economic sectors, development of synergies with other economic sectors;

(h) Increased awareness and knowledge about biodiversity in the general population and at a political level;

(i) Use of traditional knowledge for biodiversity conservation;

(j) Development of new, measurable targets/mission;

(k) Aichi Target 11 was lauded as measurable and clear, with an in-built understanding of what was expected and an ability to be monitored;

(l) Aichi Target 18 helped to create local-level awareness of the role of indigenous peoples and local communities and changes in local biodiversity plans;

(m) General targets and more specific, achievable, and easier to communicate sub-targets;

(n) Opportunities to share experiences between regions (e.g., Regional Seas Programme, protected areas);

(o) Opportunity to emphasize the economic role, meaning and value of biodiversity — to consider biodiversity as a benefit rather than a “cost”;

(p) Increased involvement of young people;

(q) High potential for innovation;

(r) Need for horizontal integration;

(s) Give nature a voice.

2. The challenges identified included:

(a) Monitoring and implementation of NBSAPs/implementation of Strategic Plan need to be enhanced;

- (b) Need for an efficient communication mechanism between various governmental bodies/sectors;
- (c) Need for ambitious but achievable targets;
- (d) Difficulties in implementing Aichi Targets: too general, too complicated and failed to take into account regional specificities;
- (e) Insufficient links to other sectors made (e.g., climate change, circular economy);
- (f) Time frame must be long enough;
- (g) Regional challenges must be taken into account;
- (h) Low level of awareness of biodiversity and its loss among governmental bodies and decision-makers, as well as the general public. Strategic Plan not well communicated to the general public;
- (i) Constant restructuring of governmental bodies responsible for nature protection;
- (j) Limited allocation of financial and human resources towards the implementation of NBSAPs;
- (k) Failure to include the Cartagena and Nagoya protocols in Aichi Targets. It is essential to include the protocols in the new framework;
- (l) Indicators developed after the targets, leading to a lack of baselines;
- (m) Need to build capacity for data collection and sharing;
- (n) Terms such as “nature protection”, “biodiversity” and “ecosystem services” are not well understood;
- (o) Corruption influences level of implementation;
- (p) Number of external drivers of pressure on biodiversity;
- (q) Civil society not involved;
- (r) Intersectoral conflicts/lack of involvement of other sectors;
- (s) Mainstreaming biodiversity in local strategic and spatial plans hampered by lack of functional frameworks and action for applying across sectors;
- (t) Need ownership and involvement from all sectors of government (e.g., economy and business) from the start;
- (u) Environment is not high enough on the political agenda (e.g., link it to the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development).

II. *Participants were asked to reflect on how the structure, content and political positioning of the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020 was, or was not, useful for their work in their countries, and what could be improved.*

1. Among useful/helpful factors, responses included:
 - (a) Inclusion of main sectors in the implementation of NBSAPs;
 - (b) Level of awareness of the general public has increased;
 - (c) Development of new financial mechanisms and financial resources.
2. Factors cited as not useful/helpful included:
 - (a) Indicators are too global and complicated to implement;

- (b) Lack of prioritization at the national level;
 - (c) Lack of financial resources, human capacity and institutional opportunities for the implementation of NBSAPs;
 - (d) Lack of sufficient flexibility for different countries and regions.
3. Areas cited as in need of improvement included:
- (a) Use a “bottom-up” approach (moving from national to global level) to develop a new strategic plan and indicators;
 - (b) Take into consideration regional challenges with a different approach;
 - (c) Take into consideration national problems, such as those relating to funding;
 - (d) Enhance the awareness of decision makers about the objectives of the post-2020 strategy and, in particular, the consequences of insufficient implementation;
 - (e) Enhance monitoring of national implementation of the strategy;
 - (f) Add a complaint mechanism.

Annex III

**DEVELOPING THE 2050 VISION OF LIVING IN HARMONY WITH NATURE AND
THE 2030 MISSION**

Participants were asked to discuss two questions:

- (a) What is your vision of the year 2050 and the state of biodiversity in 2050/What is the meaning of “living in harmony with nature”?
- (b) What actions are needed between now and 2050 to reach the 2050 Vision?

A. Vision

1. Biodiversity is conserved, protected, restored and sustainably (wisely) used.
2. No biodiversity loss, no species extinctions.
3. Nature-based solutions to development challenges, climate change, pollution, public health, etc.
4. National-level educational policy aimed at increasing awareness of the importance of biodiversity at all levels, so as to change the behaviour of society and economy.
5. Living in harmony with nature is a normal way of life, involving a habit of consciously making choices that are in harmony with nature, at the same level as other considerations, such as cost or enjoyment.
6. Humans realize that they are part of nature and act responsibly.
7. Culture is a transformational element of living in harmony with nature.
8. Green economy: easiest options for lifestyles and business are “green” ones.
9. Gender equality in governance.
10. Knowledge/education on living in harmony with nature is valued and accessible to all/everyone (government officials, scientist, children).
11. Education provided regarding the state of nature and how and why it is changing.
12. Biodiversity is protected from harmful impacts (responsible production and sustainable use; spatial planning; causes of climate change are taken into account).
13. Good data infrastructure for mainstreaming biodiversity.
14. Strategic approach to resolve spatial conflicts.
15. Indigenous peoples viewed as models for living in harmony with nature.
16. Certification of products in order to integrate the vision of the Convention on Biological Diversity in the market.

B. Milestones towards 2050

1. Adopt a mid-way target, such as 2035; then a five-year strategy and global review process each five years in order to ensure progress.
2. Need milestones to avoid getting lost over too long time period. Also, restoration takes many years to achieve.
3. All public and economic sectors are informed, and ecosystem services are accessible.
4. Partnership is established among various sectors for the purposes of conservation of biodiversity.

5. All decisions are made with due account being taken of their impact on biodiversity and ecosystem services.
6. New technologies are aimed at conservation of biodiversity and are more accessible.
7. Existence of strong technical and scientific cooperation.
8. Public awareness-raising strategies are successful (deliver results), including awareness of traditional knowledge.
9. Biodiversity is not taken for granted by policymakers, civil society, business, youth. All need to be made aware of how biodiversity and nature are important for their lives/sectors.
10. Topic is made more relevant to the public.
11. Economic valuation of nature/ecosystem services established.
12. Finances are mobilized.
13. All stakeholders involved in decisions and solutions.
14. High-level political commitment to living in harmony with nature.
15. Vision is successfully marketed.
16. Concept of “fear” (of ecological collapse) is replaced by concept of “dream” (of “living in harmony with nature”).

Annex IV

**OUT-OF-THE-BOX THINKING AND TOOLS FOR AN AMBITIOUS POST-2020
GLOBAL FRAMEWORK**

During this session, a range of ideas were expressed on several topics, including:

1. *Targets and indicators:*

- (a) Add a new target: “By 2030 every country has publicly accessible information on the species, ecosystems and ecosystem services necessary for sustainable development and lifestyles in harmony with nature”.
- (b) Add SMART goals in connection with the Sustainable Development Goals, conservation and restoration of ecosystem services, resource mobilization and communication.
- (c) Develop SMART indicators and subtargets.
- (d) Create target(s) for the private sector, encouraging a switch to green business models.
- (e) Add new target/goal: Partnership for the goals, in line with Sustainable Development Goal 17, with governments, the private sector, and civil society.
- (f) Use of minimum rights standards (United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples) as an indicator.
- (g) Use traditional knowledge as an indicator.

2. *Financing:*

- (a) Biodiversity incorporated in investment decisions in both the private and public sectors.
- (b) An exciting description of a national and global economy that is designed and managed in harmony with nature.
- (c) Ensure that ecosystem accounting and comprehensive wealth accounts are well-developed, financed, operationalized and mainstreamed across governments.
- (d) Enable trade in values for nature – Green Bitcoin.

3. *Indigenous peoples and local communities:*

- (a) Traditional practices and knowledge recognized and distributed as best practices.
- (b) Consider traditions of each nation in terms of sustainable use of natural resources.

4. *Elements for a post-2020 global biodiversity framework:*

- (a) Develop a mechanism that forces national Governments (respective ministries) to develop joint realistic action plans based on research of the issues and situations in those countries, particularly developing countries (such as least developed countries and countries with economies in transition).
- (b) Knowledge platform to be used for policy development at a governmental and regional level, as well as for the development of plans at all levels.
- (c) A clear conceptual framework that shows how nature is fundamental to achieving the Sustainable Development Goals.
- (d) Address biosafety more fully.

5. *Science and technology:*

- (a) Open access technology to show impact on biodiversity by land users.
- (b) Use technology and science to change how the food supply works – reduce agricultural areas, increase natural ecosystems, avoid the use of pesticides and fertilizers.
- (c) Raise relevance of science to the governmental level and attract additional funding.

- (d) Ensure that decisions on conservation of biodiversity are science-based.
 - (e) Develop special science-based programmes at the global, regional and national levels to support scientific research in interrelated multidisciplinary areas aimed at biodiversity conservation.
6. *Value of biodiversity/raising awareness:*
- (a) Raise awareness about importance of biodiversity conservation by showing that it is part of the ecosystem that has economic value/benefit for the country.
 - (b) Establish economic incentives for organizations, people whose activities affect the conservation of species, forests, rivers and other ecosystems.
 - (c) Promote economic incentives through media resources, such as television, radio and the Internet.
 - (d) Raise biodiversity conservation issues at the government level equally with other priorities.
 - (e) Use positive experiences from other countries in terms of conservation of certain threatened animal species (e.g., tiger, snow leopard, panda).
7. *Climate change:*
- (a) Closer link between biodiversity, climate change and sustainable development.
 - (b) Global deal: Biodiversity and climate and people.
8. *Cooperation:*
- (a) Ensure cooperation with other agreements/conventions on climate change, invasive alien species, plant protection.
9. *Gender:*
- (a) Ensure gender balance at all levels of decision-making.
10. *Other ideas:*
- (a) Ministers for nature and for development should switch roles for one year.
 - (b) Tax meat consumption.
 - (c) Establish a global treaty for biodiversity and climate change.
 - (d) Shift focus from “use” to “learn from”.
 - (e) Eradicate environmental crimes through international cooperation.
 - (f) Integrate biodiversity conservation explicitly into every law.
 - (g) Create a detailed, public, interactive map showing environmental parameters of the area.
 - (h) Ban all new hydropower projects.
 - (i) Slow globalization.
 - (j) Regional urban development plans should include measures enabling conservation of biodiversity accessible to and adopted by all communities (city, rural).
 - (k) Develop knowledge maps.

Annex V

ELEMENTS OF THE POST-2020 FRAMEWORK

A. Structure and principles of organization of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework

1. The following reorganization of the framework with goals and targets grouped into three broad clusters was suggested:
 - (a) *State of biodiversity and ecosystem services* (with goals/targets for species and broad ecosystem types – terrestrial, including fresh waters and marine);
 - (b) *Pressures and drivers of biodiversity loss* (sustainable use of biodiversity, agriculture, forestry, fisheries, etc.; Aichi Target 4 on sustainable consumption and production important but not widely adopted – need more information on impacts of unsustainable consumption and production and how to reverse this);
 - (c) *Enabling activities* (financing (this term is preferred over “resource mobilization”), capacity-building, awareness-raising and education, knowledge and information on biodiversity, ecosystem services, economic values and costs of loss of biodiversity, and pathways to achieve all the targets).
2. Participants agreed that targets were needed for the biosafety and access and benefit-sharing protocols, but not for cross-cutting issues (e.g., gender, traditional knowledge), which should be integrated with other targets.
3. Characteristics and principles of a successful framework that were mentioned included: ease of use, implementation and monitoring; clear, non-technical language; flexibility at different scales; specificity and measurability; practicality; steps for key players; linkages made and harmony promoted between ecological and economic sectors; achievability and ambitiousness; and its preparation should be participatory in nature, to encourage wide ownership and resources.
4. The need for flexibility at national or other scales was noted, as was a suggestion to have regional goals.
5. Regarding achievement dates, participants felt that they could vary from target to target.
6. There was general agreement on the desirability of establishing milestones toward the 2050 Vision but no specific proposals as to what they should be. Some suggestions emerged for a milestone to 2035 as a half-way point to 2050, or milestones every 5 or 10 years, but there were no strong views on this. It was suggested that an overall outcome or measure of the state of biodiversity would be ideal, but recognition that the complexity of the biodiversity concept makes this difficult.
7. Some participants expressed the opinion that the structure and content of the current Strategic Plan could be retained, as long as new targets are SMART (specific, measurable, achievable, relevant and time-bound), with practical indicators in place from the start (adopted in a package with the new framework). The tabular structure of the Cartagena Protocol strategy was cited as a good example to follow. The addition of a flowchart was also suggested.

B. Mainstreaming/integration of the protocols to the Convention on Biological Diversity, multilateral environmental agreements and other relevant processes

8. Participants agreed on the importance of involving sectors beyond those that are normally aware of the process under the Convention on Biological Diversity by mainstreaming the concept of biodiversity. However, some participants noted that the term “mainstreaming” was difficult to translate and easily misinterpreted in other languages.
9. It was noted that the Convention should be better and more widely known by other ministries, not just by ministries of environment, as was the need for an open dialogue with various ministerial offices to increase their understanding of how biodiversity helps them to achieve their aims.

10. Every sector may have its own target relevant to them.
11. The need to identify relevant sectors/stakeholders and involve them early on was noted. Sectors mentioned included business, financial institutions, mining, forestry, energy, transport and agriculture. Biodiversity needs to be mainstreamed into business models, and issues of biosafety and access and benefit-sharing should be included in economic considerations.
12. The need to involve the private sector was specifically mentioned in that context, in particular by encouraging business leaders to consider biodiversity as a strength, and that its wise use is beneficial to their activities. Participants noted the need for the private sector to invest in biodiversity and pay for it, in much the same way as they pay salaries to employees, for example. They noted that, by placing a price on actions in terms of their environmental impacts, the public sector would be encouraged to find alternatives, make better investments and promote innovation.
13. Several groups suggested the use of natural capital accounting reports or a system of environmental economic accounts across agendas to influence mainstreaming and decision-making. The Natural Capital Committee (United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland) was mentioned in that context.
14. Participants had different ideas on how to engage those sectors, though several mentioned a need to involve them in the early stages of developing the framework. Some noted that biodiversity issues should be included in regional development plans and spatial planning, while others noted the need to develop targets jointly with other sectors so that they would understand and take ownership of and responsibility for those targets.

Relationship with other relevant processes

15. Participants emphasized the importance of adopting a holistic approach and achieving synergy/compatibility among environmental conventions, including the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC) and its climate change mitigation programme, the United Nations Convention to Combat Desertification (UNCCD), the Ramsar Convention, and the development of common language, definitions, goals, targets and indicators, noting that the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development should be at the core of the framework.
16. Regarding the way to achieve this, different approaches were suggested, including: (a) a global-level “compliance mechanism” for all environmental conventions that could function through a “commission body” consisting of representatives from different sectors; (b) development of common action programmes; (c) mobilization of resources for specific global issues; and (d) contact/coordination between focal points of different conventions.
17. Regarding the protocols, participants agreed on the need for special targets for Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety and the Nagoya Protocol on Access and Benefit-sharing to be included in the post-2020 framework. In terms of the Cartagena Protocol, some noted that risk assessment is the main point that needs to be reflected in the post-2020 framework and that it should be the basic element uniting all the sectors, while others wanted the focus to be wider, including genetically modified organisms, synthetic biology and digital sequence information. Some noted that the inclusion of the protocols gave them added weight in the eyes of governments, and that it affected mobilization of resources, capacity-building and development of NBSAPs.

C. Resource mobilization/voluntary commitments and contributions

18. Many participants noted the need to look beyond traditional sources of funding for biodiversity for the post-2020 period, such as regional and development banks, the private sector and innovative financial mechanisms, insurance, banking, mobile companies, crowd funding, green loans, individual funding through tax reductions and philanthropy.

19. Some participants expressed the view that the resource mobilization strategy and/or any targets related to resource mobilization should be informed by an estimate of the financial implications of implementing the post-2020 global biodiversity framework and its individual targets.
20. It was suggested that linking biodiversity financing to climate change, in particular from the Green Climate Fund adopted under UNFCCC and the Sustainable Development Goals could help to increase the resources available.
21. More generally, the need for a more effective use of resources was noted.
22. With regard to GEF, some participants felt that simpler procedures were required in order to access financial support. It was also mentioned that more dialogue should be maintained with eligible Parties, as was the need for parallel consultations between GEF and the Convention.
23. Regarding voluntary commitments and contributions, some participants noted the need for compulsory commitments from all Parties. The need was also expressed for a clear, simple mechanism for making those commitments and a mechanism, such as an online repository, for monitoring them and making them transparent. The desire was expressed for a coalition of environmental organizations or businesses to increase the impact of voluntary commitments. In terms of the private sector, the idea was expressed that commitments could not only be financial, but also in terms of making their business model more environmentally sustainable.

D. Implementation and NBSAPs/new mechanisms for accountability and review processes

1. NBSAPs

24. Participants expressed the view that the implementation and effectiveness of NBSAPs could be strengthened by the design of SMART (specific, measurable, achievable, relevant and time-bound), concrete global targets that are few in number, aligned with targets in other sectors, supported by specific actions, and understandable by ministries. It was pointed out that if the framework's targets were SMART, so, too, would the NBSAPs.
25. As indicated above (see discussion under mainstreaming), participants want to see synergy with other global processes, as well as with other national sectors (e.g., finance, agriculture, infrastructure, forests). The idea of establishing a framework to promote active dialogue between different sectors was also put forward.
26. It was noted that making NBSAPs participatory, through the involvement of civil society and scientific societies, among others, would lend a sense of ownership to the process.
27. Participants held the view that the post-2020 framework would bring political visibility and attention to NBSAPs that would, in turn, help to coordinate activities with other sectors (mainstream) and would also exert "pressure" on national Governments in terms of environmental legislation.
28. Participants also held the view that guidance was needed on how to align NBSAPs with the new framework, and that if the new Strategic Plan kept a structure similar to the previous one, alignment would be easier. The view was expressed that the targets in the new framework should be measurable and aligned with the targets in other processes and institutions, and that indicators should be formulated from the very beginning of the process. Current national strategies would have to be reviewed to make sure they were aligned with the new framework, and, if not, the switch to the new framework would require assistance. As it could take years to align them, Parties should be encouraged to start now in parallel with global processes. It was also noted that the framework should provide guidance on how to align NBSAPs with it.

2. Accountability and review processes

29. Participants were of the view that the new plan should prescribe measures to increase the accountability of Parties and to encourage enhanced implementation, and that it should integrate a

mechanism by which the Secretariat of the Convention on Biological Diversity could provide feedback on national reports.

30. Participants indicated that increasing consistency in the reporting system would aid comparisons of the levels of progress achieved. It was noted that an implementation/monitoring/data-management/-legal mechanism established at the national level could also improve reporting.

31. A need for support was mentioned, in terms of making available digital platforms/tools on which to base national reporting. Such tools would increase capacity to manage information over the long term. The gathering, coordination, organization and processing of data was also mentioned as an obstacle. The need for a reliable funding source for implementation was also mentioned.

32. Participants suggested that national reporting should be considered in the new framework in a more integrated fashion, with a view to ensuring the provision of structured feedback/recommendations on how national Governments should improve implementation. It was also noted that differences in the format of national reports over the years made it difficult to compare progress; thus, there was a need to establish a consistent format for the whole period.

33. It was suggested that an interministerial working group or committee be established, above the Ministry of Environment, to ensure buy-in from other sectors nationally; others mentioned the need for interdisciplinary working groups. The need for a compliance mechanism was mentioned, as was the need for an expert task force to oversee the strategies submitted at the drafting stage.

Annex VI

KEY ISSUES AND GAPS

The main ideas emerging from the group discussions on key issues and gaps are as follows:

1. Regarding *involvement of others*, participants stressed the importance of identifying:
 - (a) The purpose of this cooperation (the desired result) and the importance of making the cooperation goal-oriented;
 - (b) The stakeholders with whom engagement is desired (e.g., scientific, industry, financial, agriculture and forestry were all mentioned, as was the importance of engaging indigenous peoples and local communities). It was stressed that the post-2020 framework would need to explain how activities/commitments related to the Convention on Biological Diversity would benefit actors in other sectors. It was noted that process of engaging stakeholders is a major undertaking that must be led by trained experts so that emerging relationships are not endangered. It was noted also that other sectors should be involved both in the process of formulating targets and during the implementation phase. It was stressed that Governments should be responsible for engaging other partners;
 - (c) What kind of engagement is desired (e.g., continue to use the existing “carrot and stick” approach, involving “carrot” – incentives, indicators, access to data, research tailored to policies – and “stick” – enforcing regulations, rules, limitations. The post-2020 framework should develop formats for such mechanisms to enable countries to develop appropriate structures in their countries. Participants stressed the importance of using simple, accessible language in order to increase engagement.

Examples were mentioned of ongoing processes to explore for reducing biodiversity loss, such as the Belt and Road Initiative (a greening strategy adopted by the Government of China), the European Union’s Green Infrastructure Strategy and the Forest Certification System.
2. Regarding *synergies* (protocols to the Convention on Biological Diversity, Aarhus Convention, other multilateral environmental agreements, Rio conventions):
 - (a) Participants strongly emphasized the need to enhance synergy between the Convention on Biological Diversity and other conventions. Participants noted, however, that it was a complicated task and were less clear on how to achieve it. The need to include in the framework a mechanism to ensure synergy between the biodiversity-related/Rio conventions was mentioned, and it was suggested that a compliance committee or similar mechanism be established at the international level;
 - (b) It was suggested that joint goals and tasks be developed between the three Rio conventions;
 - (c) It was suggested that, under “enabling activities”, other conventions should be requested to incorporate it in their work;
 - (d) In terms of reporting, it was noted that each convention had a unique format of reporting, and that the ideal was to have a mechanism for streamlined, common reporting, ideally online. It was noted that that type of reporting would need a specialist responsible for it, and that it would be time-consuming and dependent on an Internet connection. It was suggested that the Secretariat look into the development of an online common reporting tool;
 - (e) It was suggested that, if one person were focal point for several multilateral environmental agreements, that would provide a good opportunity to improve the synergy between them.

Annex VII

TECHNICAL AND SCIENTIFIC COOPERATION

Participants mentioned the following challenges and approaches to improve technical and scientific cooperation to support the post-2020 global biodiversity framework:

(a) *Increase involvement of scientists*: it was noted that some countries in the region had strong scientific expertise, but that it was a challenge to involve experts in the work of the Convention. It was observed that meetings of the Convention on Biological Diversity were primarily attended by civil servants, rather than scientists, and that it was crucial to consider mechanisms or approaches to encourage the countries of the region to further involve scientists, noting that political decisions in this realm should not be made without their input. It was noted that the Central and Eastern European region in particular provided a very limited response to notifications from the secretariat of the Convention seeking nominations or input and was thus underrepresented at meetings and workshops;

(b) *Better prepare specialized scientists*: while some noted that the region had strong scientists (see above), others noted that there was an insufficient supply of specialists in particular areas, and that there was a need to better prepare young scientists;

(c) *Provide technical support*: Some participants emphasized that technical support was needed more than scientific support, as the scientific knowledge existed in the region. Participants particularly mentioned the need to increase the accessibility of existing data, through, among other things, the provision of a database connected to the Convention, for flora, geological data, DNA banks, genetic resources, data sharing, information technology (for example, to help to transfer data to digital format), findings from WWF, IPBES reports. It was suggested that the secretariat of the Convention could develop technical guidelines for access to data, to ensure accessibility while also ensuring its protection. Some Parties mentioned that they continued to rely on information in hard copy due to a lack of digitization;

(d) *Adopt a flexible approach* that takes into account the preparedness of each country to embrace a particular technology;

(e) *Establish a platform for knowledge and innovation*: Participants emphasized the need for a common database to help Parties implement each target, including educational modules, information on existing technologies, scientific information, financial resources, voluntary commitments, and information about biopiracy activities. Participants noted the importance of building networks across science centres, and the importance of involving the business sector in this area was emphasized;

(f) *Ensure funding to support scientific cooperation* between experts to ensure that their work is sustainable;

(g) *Ensure that science is conducted with a view to meeting policy needs*, which may elicit further attention/support from politicians;

(h) *Provide a proper mechanism for communication, continuous exchange and feedback* between scientists and policymakers;

(i) *Make the post-2020 framework science-based* and demonstrate the importance of science, thereby ensuring political support;

(j) *Build networks* to bring together centres of excellence so that information can be transferred to where it is needed.

Annex VIII

CAPACITY-BUILDING

1. Participants noted the following limitations to capacity-building efforts over the past decade:
 - (a) Mass media and Government bodies provide very limited information;
 - (b) Failure to provide a global capacity-building process, beyond seminars and workshops;
 - (c) No specific capacity-building plan;
 - (d) Incomplete involvement of Parties and of various stakeholder groups;
 - (e) Insufficient awareness-raising activities;
 - (f) Failure to address needs of indigenous peoples and local communities, including increasing knowledge about ABS;
 - (g) Insufficient preparation provided to Parties prior to the adoption of the protocols;
 - (h) Lack of information available in national languages of countries of the former Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, and the high cost and the time-consuming nature of translation;
 - (i) Limited availability of Internet access in some countries;
 - (j) Limited capacity to develop NBSAPs, which become an added burden in countries without dedicated staff/centres;
 - (k) Limited awareness of the information sources that do exist, even among those who really need it;
 - (l) Lack of preparation/time: this issue was new to the Central and Eastern European region, and time was needed to act. National capacity-building strategies had to be prepared after the Strategic Plan had been adopted, rather than in advance, delaying the process;
 - (m) Funding for that purpose was received halfway through the 10-year time-line, thereby delaying the process;
2. Regarding what should be done to improve capacity-building during the post-2020 period, participants noted the following:
 - (n) Donors, such as GEF, should start working on providing financing while the framework is being developed, so that Parties can be better prepared;
 - (o) Capacity-building should be a continuous process;
 - (p) Capacity-building for biodiversity and related issues should be provided in other sectors;
 - (q) Provide a train-the-trainer approach, so that training can be provided to local communities in the national language;
 - (r) Collaborate with various partners and institutions, including academia and local communities, to tailor curriculum and transfer capacity, including through innovative, informal capacity-building;
 - (s) Provide the opportunity to learn by doing, through the use of videos with supporting materials, rather than solely through written materials;
 - (t) Create online video courses in different languages;
 - (u) Use social media;
 - (v) Provide both knowledge and practice, using an interactive process involving coaching, so that the principles can become part of daily practice.

Annex IX

SHAPING A NEW NARRATIVE FOR BIODIVERSITY, COMMUNICATION AND OUTREACH

1. In terms of how the post-2020 global biodiversity framework should address issues related to communications and awareness, participants suggested the following:

- (a) The framework should be communicated more simply;
- (b) Language needs to be simpler and more appropriate;
- (c) Specific target on communication not needed;
- (d) Increased use of traditional knowledge.

2. As for how to improve its communication efforts, participants suggested:

- (a) Use simpler language, focusing less on the term “biodiversity”;
 - (b) Find a balance between negative and positive messaging;
 - (c) Produce a newsletter on activities carried out under the Convention on Biological Diversity;
 - (d) Make booklets/brochures available in local languages;
 - (e) More communication on the benefits of ecosystem services;
 - (f) Gear communications efforts towards various audiences, including children/youth and the public and private sectors;
 - (g) Encourage youth to become involved in biodiversity as a career choice;
 - (h) Create educational videos;
 - (i) Involve the use of celebrities to promote biodiversity awareness;
 - (j) Continue social-media engagement;
 - (k) Develop catchy slogans;
 - (l) Design communications for mobile phones/apps;
 - (m) Create a thematic group for scientists that holds international conferences on biodiversity.
-