

## Post-2020 Global Biodiversity Framework

Through notification 2017-052, the Executive Secretary invited comments and inputs concerning preparations for the post-2020 biodiversity framework. The following comments are provided by the UN Environment World Conservation Monitoring Centre (UNEP-WCMC) based on experience of working with the convention and its implementation spanning 25 years. We look forward to working with the Secretariat and Parties on development of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework.

### **Process**

1. **2050 Vision:** It is obvious that development of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework should take account of the discussions at SBSTTA-21 and COP-14 on the 2050 vision and pathways for achieving it. This is likely to include further work on models and scenarios, working together with key players in this area.
2. **Broad ownership:** Whatever process is followed in developing the post-2020 global biodiversity framework, it will be important to build a broad ownership of the outcome, even though at COP-15 it will be Parties adopting it and not the range of other interested stakeholders. This is an exercise in communication as much as involvement.
3. **Lessons learnt from achievement and lack of achievement:** A wide range of lessons learnt will become available over the next couple of years, including reviews of progress and achievement, and of challenges and barriers. These lessons all need to be taken into account, including from the: Biodiversity Indicators Partnership; Global Biodiversity Outlook; sixth national reports; various assessments being conducted by the Intergovernmental Platform on Biodiversity and Ecosystem Services; and scientific literature. This will include reviews from a wide range of stakeholders with a range of difference perspectives.
4. **Effectiveness of policy options:** Over the next year or so there is expected to be increasing review of the effectiveness of different policy options. This will also be informed by some of the reviews identified above. Lessons learnt from this need to be taken into account in developing the post-2020 global biodiversity framework.
5. **Lessons from experience in developing NBSAPs:** Lessons need be learned from the experience of Parties in taking the Aichi goals and targets and addressing them within their own national contexts as they developed their NBSAPs. This is important in ensuring a future framework that is as effective as possible in promoting and facilitating action at the national level.
6. **Involvement of other MEAs:** Other MEAs have welcomed and responded to the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020 and its Aichi Biodiversity Targets, and the targets have had a potentially significant impact on increasing coherence in implementation of MEAs because of this increase in appreciation of the relationships. This has also led to increased opportunity for collaboration at the national level. Liaison with other conventions/processes in developing the post-2020 agenda is therefore important for building on this.
7. **Learning from how the Aichi targets are used:** In addition to learning from national experience, and working with other MEAs, it would also be valuable to review more broadly how the Aichi Biodiversity Targets have been used by different stakeholders and different sectors, in order to inform development of the post-2020 framework for biodiversity.
8. **Science-based targets:** While science should not drive what is a political and aspirational process, there is value in the process being informed by and taking account of relevant scientific understanding relating to targets and target setting, including the understanding of the implications of not reaching particular targets, and use of models to explore potential impacts of different scenarios.

9. Understanding the links to the 2030 Agenda: At first sight some of the Aichi targets have been superseded by targets under the SDGs, so particular consideration may need to be given to reorienting or reframing the post-2020 global biodiversity framework with respect to issues such as national accounting, subsidies, incentives, and sustainable consumption and production.
10. Involvement of indicator partners: While the availability of indicators should not drive development of the framework or the goals/targets within it, consideration of potential indicators at the same time as developing the framework should help in developing SMARTer targets, and in exploring their scalability.
11. Links to the capacity-building strategy: It will be important to build links between the post-2020 global biodiversity framework and the long-term strategic framework for capacity building due to be developed over the same period of time and adopted at the same COP. This might include, for example, developing understanding of the capacity required for achieving particular outcomes.

## Content

12. Global relevance: Alignment with other intergovernmental processes is important for action at both global and national levels, and for building coherence and benefitting from synergies, so the post-2020 global biodiversity framework should clearly set out how it will underpin delivery of:
  - 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development
  - Paris Agreement under the UNFCCC
  - Sendai Framework on Disaster Risk Reduction
13. Relevance to society: It will be valuable to produce and communicate a post-2020 global biodiversity framework that has clear relevance and actions for all sectors of society (including government, business and civil society), where any goals and targets relating to biodiversity and ecosystem services are placed in a clear and relevant context.
14. Clarity and adaptability: Translation into action at the national level is critical to achievement of the Convention's objectives, so the framework and any goals/targets within it need to be easily understood in terms of desired outcomes, and adaptable to both national and subnational scales. Increased clarity may be assisted by inclusion of diagrams and graphics.
15. Understanding progress in the future: It may be valuable to ensure that whatever targets are developed, each has at least one measurable component, and that consideration during the negotiation/development process is given to reviewing the existing baseline data underpinning the targets/indicators, such that targets and their indicators are considered together rather than sequentially.
16. Conceptual framework: A clear conceptual framework demonstrating the relationship between any strategic goals and targets is important for subsequently creating NBSAPs with strategic goals and targets that are mutually supportive, and lead to linking silos of actions in Ministries, sectors etc.
17. "Levels" of target: Consideration might be given to not making all of the targets equal, or at least having core targets around biodiversity conservation and secondary ones that are perhaps less fully defined. For example, a process target relating to update of NBSAPs is not the same level as a target related to preventing extinction of species.
18. Single integrated package: Any goals and targets developed need to be seen as a single integrated package, getting away from the focus of particular groups on "their" targets (for example Aichi Targets 11 and 12) and the lack of integration of some targets (for example Aichi Target 19) in the current strategic plan.

19. Communication and interpretation: Whatever the final form of the framework, it will be necessary to helping key actors in implementing it (national governments, funders, NGOs) to understand the reasoning for the design of targets and options to achieve them. The framework should not be expressed solely as text documents, but comprise innovative and compelling graphic materials and videos that can be adapted by national actors.
20. National Determined Contributions: Linked with format, completion and adoption of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework, consideration should be given to whether an analogous process could be followed to that under the UNFCCC in seeking some form of national determined contributions across a global framework. Such NDCs could form the basis for monitoring, “gap analysis”, and in some instances collectively determining more realistic global levels of ambition.