

**Submission by the EU and its Member States to CBD Notification 2018-063:**

**initial views on the aspects of the scope and contents of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework, including scientific underpinning and possible structure  
and  
experiences in implementing Aichi Biodiversity Target 20 as well as the strategy and the targets for resource mobilization, and in using relevant guidance, and initial views on the scope and content of the resource mobilization component of the post-2020 biodiversity framework**

***Introduction***

The EU and its Member States would like to provide the following initial views with regards to the scope and contents of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework, as well as its scientific underpinning and possible structure. These views may develop further, particularly in the light of internal consultations and consultations with other Parties, International organisations and Multilateral Environmental Agreements (MEAs) and stakeholders, including outcomes of key processes outside the CBD. We are looking forward to their contributions and the upcoming debates and the development of the framework in the open-ended inter-sessional working group established by COP 14.

We would furthermore like to stress the importance of a strong communication campaign at all levels to support the development of the post-2020 framework. It should increase visibility of the biodiversity crisis, highlight the urgency of stepping up actions necessary for achieving the objectives, and foster cooperation.

***General***

The EU and its Member States call for the adoption of an ambitious follow-up to the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020 that provides an overarching biodiversity framework across the UN and for all stakeholders towards the 2050 Vision on biodiversity. The framework should strengthen the implementation of the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD) and its Protocols, as well as of the other biodiversity related multilateral environmental agreements (MEAs) and relevant SDGs. The framework should place biodiversity and ecosystem services high on political agendas.

This call by the EU and its Member States is underpinned by a Resolution from the European Parliament, which acknowledges protection of global biodiversity as an essential challenge, and thus a strategic EU interest that should receive the highest political attention.

***Scientific underpinning***

A sound scientific underpinning and knowledge base are of utmost importance. This encompasses, i.a., the IPBES regional assessments and the IPBES assessment of land degradation and restoration, the upcoming IPBES global assessment on biodiversity and ecosystem services and other reports such as FAO's State of the World's Biodiversity for food and agriculture, GEO-6, the Global Resource Outlook 2019 from the International Resource Panel, the IPCC reports on 1.5°C on land, on oceans/cryosphere and the Global Land Outlook from the UNCCD. As also reflected in the SBSTTA conclusions regarding scenarios for the 2050 vision (CBD/COP/14L.30), these provide strong evidence of the scale of the challenges and the associated timelines and the need to take immediate, commensurate and effective actions for achieving the 2050 Vision.

It will be necessary to foster a broader common understanding on what the 2050 vision means in more detail. Scenario analysis will be important for clarifying the policy options and trade-offs and defining the key milestones.

### ***Possible structure, scope and contents of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework***

#### *Possible scope*

A broad scope that addresses all key direct and indirect drivers of biodiversity loss will remain desirable. A narrow focus on a selective set of issues will not allow achieving the 2050 Vision.

Moreover, the relationship between the post 2020 framework and the Agenda 2030 for Sustainable Development and the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) should be kept in mind. A clear relationship is important to facilitate the understanding both by the wide public and by the policy makers that achieving the SDGs and the objectives of the Paris Agreement depends on achieving the biodiversity objectives.

#### *Possible structure*

In order to contribute to the achievement of the 2050 vision for biodiversity under the CBD, the post 2020 biodiversity framework could include the following structural elements:

- 2030 Mission,
- Targets,
- Milestones,
- Indicators,
- Instruments,
- Measurement, reporting and verification system,
- Review and ratcheting mechanism.

The targets need to be ambitious, realistic, and as far as possible, measurable and time-bound, strengthening and building upon the current Aichi Targets, driving action and allowing progress to be tracked effectively. Where feasible, they need to be accompanied by clear baselines, indicators and reporting schemes, which need to be developed in parallel and should be based as much as possible on existing work (both in CBD and SDG context) and be adopted altogether in 2020. E.g. as custodian agency for some of the SDGs, the FAO developed an approved methodology for data to report on sustainable agriculture which takes into consideration biodiversity elements, pollination, etc. Using such 'sector' tools could enhance involvement of those sectors and facilitate the mainstreaming. It may also be desirable to specify sub-targets or milestones for the various biomes

The option of keeping the structure based on five strategic goals should not be discarded at this stage. For multiple reasons achieving the current targets is challenging. These challenges cannot be (solely) assigned to the structure of the current framework and the formulation of the current targets.

An alternative option would reflect the different levels/nature of the Aichi Biodiversity targets: some are long-term, others are short-term, some are global, others are scale-dependent, some are under environment responsibility, others are sectoral, etc. The targets could be presented/structured in a way that allows a clearer messaging and focus. E.g., a clearer focus could be on actions that address the most important drivers of biodiversity loss, distinguishing more clearly from supporting and enabling conditions.

In this discussion, suggestions for potential targets not covered by the current framework should be taken into account.

The EU and its Member States wish to raise for further discussion the possible inclusion of an overarching measurable target/objective/message and/or the need to make progress towards the 2050 Vision more measurable. This could foster political traction for the post 2020 framework. Inspiring developments have been presented at side-events and at the 4th Science Forum organised at CBD COP14.<sup>1</sup>

#### *Review and ratcheting mechanism*

Decision XIV/... requests the further development of the multidimensional review mechanism. For effective review, it is particularly important to develop the monitoring and reporting framework in parallel with the targets. Without prejudice to the need for National Biodiversity Strategies and Action Plans (NBSAPs) to take account of national circumstances, the post-2020 framework could include stronger provisions for alignment of NBSAPs and the post-2020 framework, so as to facilitate review and an assessment whether the efforts foreseen in the NBSAPs collectively allow achieving the global targets/ objectives. This would also allow taking account of new scientific evidence in a more flexible and timely manner.

#### *Possible contents*

Regardless of their place in the overall framework, the following remarks concern individual areas or subsets of issues that could be considered and merit further discussion.

As decided by COP 14, Article 8j needs to be better integrated in the post 2020 framework.

As regards protected areas and other effective area-based conservation measures (OECMs) it will remain important to focus not only on the quantitative dimension, but also on representativeness, connectivity and effective and equitable management and resourcing.

For an effective post-2020 framework, it is indispensable to address mainstreaming of biodiversity across sectors. As in the current Strategic Plan, mainstreaming of biodiversity in agriculture, forestry, fisheries and aquaculture should be addressed separately. This is without prejudice to the need to address the genetic diversity of cultivated plants and farmed and domesticated animals and of wild relatives. The best way to address other sectors, including the financial sector, and how this would relate to the long-term strategic approach to mainstreaming as established and further developed pursuant to Decision XIV/..., remains to be seen. For all sectors, stakeholders concerned should be closely involved.

The post-2020 framework should highlight nature's important contributions to people in all aspects (climate change mitigation and adaptation including through nature-based solutions, poverty eradication, human well-being and health, energy, etc.). It should encourage the use and further development of methodologies, metrics and tools for assessing the value of nature and promote collaboration between public and private actors in this regard.

---

<sup>1</sup> See e.g. the recent article by Georgina Mace et al (see CBD/COP/14/9 page 3). Further references include: Mace et al. (2014) "Approaches to defining a planetary boundary for biodiversity, Glob. Environ. Change 28, 289–297 (2014); Steffen et al (2015) Planetary boundaries: Guiding human development on a changing planet Science 347, 1259855. There are more approaches referred to in this text, such as Watson's Biodiversity Response (Prevent Extinction – Reverse Decline – Retain Intactness).

Decision XIV/xx, paragraph 11, invites Parties and other Governments, individually or jointly, to consider developing voluntary commitments that contribute to the achievement of the three objectives of the Convention, strengthen national biodiversity strategies and action plans, facilitate the achievement of the Aichi Biodiversity Targets and contribute to an effective post-2020 global biodiversity framework. Voluntary commitments could, furthermore, spur political momentum and provide Parties with an opportunity to take leadership on specific targets or issues. The post 2020 global biodiversity framework should establish the modalities for ensuring a strong contribution from such voluntary commitments, including for review of implementation, assessment whether they allow achieving the global targets and for ratcheting up if needed. This should be coherent with the monitoring and review mechanisms for overall implementation of the new framework as referred to above.

We aim for a solid Sharm-el-Sheikh to Beijing Action Agenda for Nature and People that encourages concrete commitments, thereby underpinning and forming part of the post-2020 framework.

Furthermore, we are assessing ways in which the global biodiversity framework should address access and benefit sharing and biosafety and we welcome views from other Parties in this respect. Further, as regards digital sequence information on genetic resources, the EU and the MS do not wish to pre-empt the outcomes of the science and policy based process foreseen in Decision XIV/.... The post-2020 global biodiversity framework should reflect the outcomes of that process.

Similarly, we recognise the importance of coherence with the long-term strategy for capacity building to be developed pursuant to Decision XIV/...

### ***Experiences in implementing Aichi Biodiversity Target 20 as well as the strategy and the targets for resource mobilization, and in using relevant guidance***

In the EU context, mainstreaming is the main approach to funding biodiversity. A number of reports have highlighted that biodiversity funding remains insufficient. Although effective mainstreaming is essential, funding for biodiversity under any given sectoral funding instruments remains dependent on the overall goals and mechanisms of each specific instrument<sup>2</sup>. Targeted funding is therefore needed to address the financing needs that are not covered by sectoral instruments, and also to provide a catalytic effect to support relevant policy implementation<sup>3</sup>. On the other hand, targeted funding programmes will only reach their full potential if complemented by appropriate mainstreaming.

The financial framework reports submitted/to be submitted to the CBD provide further insights in the experience of implementing Aichi Biodiversity Target 20 as well as the strategy and the targets for resource mobilization within the EU and its Member States.

---

<sup>2</sup> European Court of Auditors (ECA) special report No 21/2017: Greening: a more complex income support scheme, not yet environmentally effective.

<sup>3</sup> Impact Assessment accompanying the European Commission's Proposal for a Regulation of the European Parliament and of the Council on the establishment of a Programme for the Environment and Climate Action (LIFE) and repealing Regulation (EU) No 1293/2013. SWD(2018) 292 final.

## *Resource mobilization component of the post-2020 biodiversity framework*

It is important that resource mobilisation is considered as an integral part of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework from an early stage. The EU supports the establishment of an expert panel for this specific purpose as stated in Decision XIV/xx. Initial ideas for developing the resource mobilisation component can be found, for example, in the second report of the High level Panel on the Global Assessment of Resources for implementing the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020<sup>4</sup>:

- Expenditure and actions to meet the Aichi Biodiversity Targets should be recognised as part of wider investment needs for achieving sustainable development in the context of the post2015 sustainable development agenda
- Achieving the Aichi targets will help to create jobs and revenue flows and support new economic and business opportunities.
- Failing to invest in biodiversity now will increase the risks and costs in the future.
- The potential for enhancing synergies between the Aichi Targets and policies to address climate change is still not fully utilised, and there is significant scope for improvements in this regard
- Mainstreaming of biodiversity into wider policy agendas, plans and budgets, offers significant opportunities for more efficient policy-making processes and co-funding, but is still at an early stage.
- Efforts to capture the broad range of biodiversity values in accounting and reporting systems can contribute significantly to resource mobilization efforts
- Increases in dedicated funding for biodiversity action are needed but will not be sufficient. Closing the financial gap can only be achieved through realigning existing expenditures (particularly those which currently lead to biodiversity loss) with biodiversity objectives, and through improved sectoral integration. Most of the funding required to tackle the direct and indirect drivers of biodiversity loss will deliver multiple objectives and will require mainstreaming of biodiversity action into existing budgets.

In addition, given the returns on investments in biodiversity, an increased contribution from the private sector should be encouraged, in particular through better interaction with business and other sectors and sharing responsibilities. To do so, it will be important to identify and communicate how they can support the post 2020 framework. We need to ensure that key parts of the post 2020 framework can be translated easily to the private sector, not only for the mainstreaming but also to allow for increased private funding and create win-wins.

Furthermore, an increased role of blending could be explored, combining public and private funds, and combining grants with other forms of financing such as loans. Domestic resource mobilization should be also further supported through biodiversity mainstreaming in sector policies.

---

<sup>4</sup> <https://swed.bio/wp-content/uploads/2016/02/hlp-02-report-en.pdf>.