



IUCN views on the preparation, scope and content of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework

24 August 2018

This is IUCN's response to **Notification 2018-063**. We focus on both the proposed preparatory process and the content of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework.

1. The conservation imperative and the need for transformational change

The conservation imperative is more urgent than ever. Biodiversity loss continues; the *Earth's sixth mass extinction* is so severe that humanity must take measures to address the decimation of biodiversity immediately. Conservation actions are having significant impacts in reducing this loss, but are not yet implemented at sufficient scale to stabilise and ultimately reverse current trends. The loss of biodiversity leads to loss of ecosystem services and loss of livelihoods and human wellbeing. The severe consequences for humanity of biodiversity loss are a hidden terror already prevalent but rarely understood by society.

It is particularly sobering to reflect that over the last decade, despite commitment by the world's governments that "By 2020 the extinction of known threatened species has been prevented" in Aichi Target 12 of the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011–2020, The IUCN Red List of Threatened Species documents that five global extinctions have occurred. Three of these were from Australia (the bat *Pipistrellus murrayi*, the rodent *Melomys rubicola*, and the lizard *Emoia nativitatis*), one from the USA (the tree *Hibiscadelphus woodii*), and one from Ecuador (the giant tortoise *Chelonoidis abingdonii*). Given that it is likely that other species have been lost without such documentation, it is clear that irreplaceable loss of biodiversity is a scourge that is still affects countries around the world.

To secure life on Earth, we need bold, new and transformative action, underpinned by sound science and effective policy. It is now incumbent on all to support the leadership role that the Convention on Biological Diversity must take to match the challenge with a comprehensive and achievable framework of action.

The process adopted for the development of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework needs to allow substantive content to be introduced. Equally, it must reflect the need for need for its content to achieve the transformational change to achieve the 2050 Vision for biodiversity.

2. The 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development

The conservation of nature and its biodiversity elements is the basis for sustainable development and a pre-requisite to achieve the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs), the universally agreed framework for development actions and funding. The SDGs are in many ways dependent on the integrity of the biosphere, and every sectoral goal is underpinned by biodiversity elements to a greater or lesser degree. Biodiversity conservation therefore needs to be at the heart of the development mainstream.

It is essential that the post-2020 global biodiversity framework is designed and adopted as an integral part of the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development. 2020 is the achievement date for the SDG targets that directly reflect the Aichi targets of the current Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020; this is therefore an excellent opportunity to review and strengthen the

biodiversity-related targets in the 2030 Agenda as well as to address thematic gaps in the SDGs (such as on the environmental underpinnings of health). The Convention, and the biodiversity community at large, should engage positively and consistently with the UN to achieve this.

3. Vision for 2050

The current vision of this Strategic Plan is a world of “Living in harmony with nature” where “By 2050, biodiversity is valued, conserved, restored and wisely used, maintaining ecosystem services, sustaining a healthy planet and delivering benefits essential for all people.”

IUCN supports this Vision, and given its 2050 timeline, recommends that it not be revised for the post 2020 framework. However, we would like to suggest that the CBD could consider establishment of a small number of long-term 2050 science-based targets. These could serve both to operationalise the 2050 Vision, and to provide “landing lights” towards which the shorter term targets to be established under the post-2020 biodiversity framework (see below) should be heading. Such long-term 2050 targets could include, for example, “Improve the survival probability of all species to that natural over Earth’s history” and “Reduce the risk of collapse of all ecosystems to background rates”. Given the decadal timeframes necessary for ecological restoration, delivery of such targets is not possible by 2030, but their establishment for 2050 would reveal the necessity of implementation of short-term actions necessary for their achievement.

4. Mission for 2030

A new ten-year Mission of time-bound action is an essential step to galvanise the action necessary to achieve a post 2020 global biodiversity framework , and to deliver the 2050 Vision of Living in Harmony with Nature. Such Mission should be set for 2030 to link to the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development. Unlike the current Mission (which is overly long and unmemorable), this new Mission (not ‘milestone’ or ‘stepping stone’ which are passive terms) should be ambitious, succinct, specific, positively-framed, action-oriented, bold, and quotable! It should therefore be phrased in active and not passive language and be forward looking and enabling; a ‘call to action’ and communicate why this matters to people.

The 2030 Mission should constitute an overall science-based target for biodiversity that can be quantified and tracked through implementation; an appropriate equivalent of the 2°C/1.5°C temperature rise cap agreed under the Paris Climate Change Agreement. It should be possible to disaggregate nationally and sectorally to reflect the range and diversity of supporting targets and associated commitments.

It should be measurable (e.g. by focusing on component parts of biodiversity: species, ecosystems, genetic diversity), and could include the phrase “contributing to achievement of all Sustainable Development Goals”.

Above all, the Mission must express necessity as well as feasibility.

The process for developing a post-2020 biodiversity framework should allow for discussions on such a Mission for 2030. IUCN will propose wording for a Mission for 2030 to CBD COP14.

5. The five Strategic Goals

The five Strategic Goals (encompassing tackling the underlying causes of biodiversity loss, alleviating the direct pressures, improvement of biodiversity status, enhancing the benefits to all, and supporting implementation of responses) are robust and coherent.

They align well with the widely used DPSIR (Drivers, Pressures, State, Impacts, Responses) framework. It is clear however that implementation of all five Goals will require transformational change), including mainstreaming of biodiversity into development considerations, reflecting the causal relationship between specific goals and the persistence of biodiversity. This relates to Goal A ('Addressing the underlying causes of biodiversity loss...') in particular.

Ideally, targets under this goal would have parallel targets established under the non-environmentally related SDGs, as a practical mechanism to advance this mainstreaming. For example, an inheritor to the current Aichi Target 1 could be mirrored with addition of a new target on environmental education under SDG4, an inheritor to the current Aichi Target 2 mirrored with a new target on biodiversity planning under SDG17, and an inheritor to the current Aichi Target 3 mirrored with a new target on subsidies under SDG8.

6. Post-2020 global 'Aichi' targets for 2030:

Altogether, IUCN considers the 20 Aichi Targets to be well conceived; there has been progress towards meeting some elements of most of them, with progress more advanced for some than others.

One feature of the targets where significant progress has been made is the level of quantification and attribution that is possible. Targets that clearly state a measurable goal and ensure accountability by Parties tend to be much further advanced. Further analysis is required to identify success factors, weaknesses and other gaps. Other targets are phrased in a way that makes them hard to measure. It is very important to move towards increased specificity and measurability across all targets. It is also very important that targets be formulated in a way that avoids any risk of establishing perverse incentives.

Post 2020, specific measureable science-based targets should have clear outcomes that demonstrably contribute to the 2030 Mission. They should also be able to be disaggregated into potential contributions and commitments towards their achievement by individual entities (see 9. on sector based targets). New targets need to be supported by a clear, analytical rationale (why is the target set at a particular level?). Outcome-oriented targets (such as the current Aichi Targets 12 and 13) should be differentiated from process-oriented ones; as noted above the current structure of five strategic goals organised across a DPSIR framework is a good way to achieve this.

Post 2020, mechanisms to address both commitment gaps (where the necessary action has not been encapsulated in a target) and implementation gaps (where the appropriate target has been formatted but not implemented) need to be established; this will be an important role for the Subsidiary Body on Implementation.

Target setting scenarios may be useful in guiding the establishment of inheritors to the Aichi Targets: that is, to start with the endpoint of "Living in Harmony with Nature", and then 'work backwards' to get the decisions / policies that are necessary to reach that endpoint. These should reinforce the clear links that need to be established between the targets, Mission and Vision, and their contribution to the SDGs.

7. Site conservation targets

The current Aichi Target 11 aspires to a sound vision for the management and governance for site-based conservation. It has elicited a response in terms of the spatial area of land and sea to be protected. Other elements of the target that concern protected area quality, e.g. equity will require more attention in this process. Post 2020, these other elements of the inheritor to Aichi Target 11 will need to be addressed to ensure genuine gains for biodiversity conservation - to ensure the effective and equitable conservation of all key biodiversity areas. The recent establishment of the Key Biodiversity Areas Partnership and Programme (<http://www.keybiodiversityareas.org/home>), and Protected Planet database (<https://www.protectedplanet.net/>) provide core resources to support Parties in implementing such a target.

At the IUCN World Parks Congress in 2014, the Promise of Sydney called for full protection of 30% of the oceans. IUCN Resolution 050 from the 2016 IUCN World Conservation Congress in Hawai'i "encourages Parties to the CBD to consider a new process for developing post-2020 targets to increase the percentage of marine areas highly protected to 30% by 2030". In taking forward this discussion it may be helpful to consider what needs to be protected in terms of areas within multi-use landscapes, the trade-offs that will be necessary in terms of food, minerals and fuel, the needs of an increasingly urbanised population, as well as the imperative to halt ecosystem conversion and to conserve areas particularly important for biodiversity.

One other important effect of Aichi Target 11 was to stimulate the process to define "other effective area-based conservation measures" (this will be considered at CBD COP 14). Post 2020, it will be of crucial importance is to identify and recognize appropriately those areas that are already conserved through the actions of indigenous peoples and local communities, as well as private actors. Some of these will be recognisable as protected areas, others as "other effective area-based conservation measures".

8. The Programmes of Work of the Convention

Post 2020, the Programmes of Work of the Convention should be aligned with and addressed under the successor to the Aichi Targets. Their achievement could be linked to discussion of progress with implementation. This could bring about efficiencies in the way that the Convention is run and how time is managed - and help Parties (and other sectors) align their work to the targets and Mission, as well as with reporting. Such a change in the workings of the Convention would be cost neutral – it is a matter of time management.

9. Specific science-based targets.

As of now, the process needs to make space for the views and contributions by non-state actors, such as the business and financial sectors, youth, indigenous peoples and local communities, women's and youth organizations, civil society organizations and cities, all of whom are making substantial inputs that need to be heard and taken account of.

The success of a truly transformative post 2020 global biodiversity framework is also clearly dependent on the contribution of both state and non-state actors. Recognition of the contributions will be essential to highlighting their potential to ramp up biodiversity conservation and unleash transformational systems change.

Any sector or entity with demonstrable commitments to implementation of the post 2020 global biodiversity framework should be given the space and time to be heard and to make commitments to contribute. A re-structuring of the Convention's workings as suggested above (section 8) would provide a place and a space to help facilitate this.

IUCN supports the development of mechanisms to disaggregate global targets into specific science-based targets for uptake by individual sectors, companies, cities, etc. in addition to countries. These would be a form of voluntary commitments (see 10. below). Such targets have played a crucial role in giving the private sector and other entities the space to creatively innovate, advancing the worldwide response to climate change.

10. Voluntary commitments

Inviting voluntary commitments from Parties could help transform the political landscape of the CBD in a more positive direction by promoting country-led action, and provide a more productive template for international cooperation on biodiversity conservation post-2020. A process and timetable for putting in place a call for voluntary commitments by all key players, should be discussed at agreed at COP14; there should then be a call for initial voluntary commitments to be submitted by CBD COP15 (setting up a process analogous to that which was adopted in the lead up to UNFCCC COP21).

For Parties, a template for national commitments could be designed to link to the successor of the Aichi targets and the 2030 Mission. These commitments will form the content of NBSAPs.

During the decade 2020–2030, voluntary commitments will need to be reviewed periodically (to determine both ‘ambition gaps’ and ‘commitment gaps’). A process for conducting ‘global stocktakes’ to monitor progress on implementation against established global biodiversity targets at fixed intervals could be put in place to enable countries to periodically enhance (‘ratchet up’) global ambition and action over time.

For non-State actors a similar mechanism should be put in place to allow both for their contributions to biodiversity conservation in general and to the global biodiversity framework and its targets in particular.

11. NBSAPs

The role of National Biodiversity Strategies and Action Plans (NBSAPs) in implementing the Convention and addressing the post-2020 global biodiversity framework should be strengthened; this relates directly to discussions on voluntary commitments (see section 10).

NBSAPs should be the vehicle for implementation of not only the CBD but also the other biodiversity-related conventions and national level implementation of the UNFCCC, UNCCD, and the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development (see section 12.).

Post 2020, the links between global and national level biodiversity targets need to be addressed, with the need to increase a sense of responsibility, accountability and commitment from Parties and Stakeholders for implementation (i.e. action) without hindering national sovereignty.

Currently, very few Parties have ‘mapped’ the targets in their NBSAPs to the whole Strategic Plan. Post 2020, Parties should be encouraged to refine their NBSAPs mapping their proposed contribution at the national level to the global level targets. Each national target should be mapped against all global targets (as appropriate) so that it is clear what the national level contribution to the global target is likely to be. Monitoring effort needs to be scaled up to assess whether national level targets would ‘add up’ in terms of their impact, to the intent of the global target. If the totality of the national targets are not likely to achieve the global target in question, and following review at each COP, relevant Parties should be requested to scale up their level of ambition.

12. Others conventions / synergies

There is a need to substantially enhance coherence and cooperation (the 'synergies') between the CBD (and its Protocols), the other two Rio Conventions, and the other biodiversity-related conventions.

These conventions need to fully engage with the development of the post 2020 biodiversity framework so that there is genuine buy-in from their own constituencies and the new framework and targets reflect concerns within those agreements. Commitments that countries have made across other Conventions which, if implemented, could also positively influence biodiversity need to be taken account of in NBSAPs, and ultimately at the global level. In this way, countries can identify additional sources of progress regarding biodiversity targets when implementing agendas under the umbrella of other key topics such as climate change or desertification.

A voluntary commitments approach would also have the benefit of supporting the harmonisation of the Rio Conventions and biodiversity-related conventions through the creation of common reporting frameworks that would maximise synergies and minimise national reporting burdens.

13. Indicators

The process for review of implementation (through indicators) of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework needs to be designed at the same time as it is developed, in order to strengthen future monitoring, reporting and verification. This requires the development of crisp and measurable targets (with elements that can be disaggregated) reflecting both process as well as status outcomes. The process should allow for the development of global indicators that can be disaggregated to the national level. Such a review process could be expanded to focus also on potential sectoral targets that seek to implement global targets.

IUCN believes that it is essential to build synergies in both implementation and reporting. The post-2020 global framework for the conservation of nature must be fully aligned to the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development and, through simultaneous reporting, tracked systematically to demonstrate its contributions towards achievement of the SDGs.

IUCN maintains the standards underpinning many of the indicators used to track progress towards the current 2011-2020 Strategic Plan for Biodiversity (e.g. ~1/3 of the indicators used in the fourth Global Biodiversity Outlook), as well as the Sustainable Development Goals, and stands ready to continue these contributions in support of the post-2020 biodiversity framework.

14. Communication and outreach strategy

IUCN agrees strongly that a comprehensive communication strategy will be essential to mobilise engagement for support of a strong post 2020 framework. There is a need to raise awareness of all stakeholders of the existence of biodiversity-related targets across the SDGs and precisely how they relate to the subject matter of the Aichi Biodiversity Targets. Such a strategy should be rolled out to optimise impact at the many events to take place between now and COP15.

The high-level biodiversity summit of Heads of State/ Heads of government scheduled for September 2020 should reinforce the biodiversity conservation underpinning essential for achievement of the SDGs. This event, however, will be rather late. Maximum use should be made of the UN Secretary General's Climate Summit in September 2019 to emphasise the

close links between combatting climate change and conserving biodiversity (given the nature-based solutions that biodiversity can contribute to climate mitigation and adaptation).

A strong communication and influencing strategy will be developed for The IUCN World Conservation Congress in June 2020.

15. The financial gap and resource mobilisation

The financing and mobilisation of resources are linked clearly to the development of the new post 2020 framework given that parties will expect clear guidance on this issue. A combination of both private and public finance will be essential to achievement the new targets, with a smart focus on how resources are deployed.

Annual global conservation needs are estimated to be USD 300-400 billion, including approximately USD 80 billion to reduce extinction risk for threatened species and safeguard key biodiversity areas, very far from the current flows of funds to conservation estimated around USD 52 billion per year. Moreover, the greatest part of current funding is domestic government spending in developed countries, instead of developing countries where the greatest need for funding exists. Maintaining and increasing public sector finance is essential; one immediate need is to ramp up biodiversity-related official development aid from its current global magnitude of about USD 10 billion.

However, public sector finance and philanthropic capital alone are not sufficient to address the gap. Therefore, the mobilization and leveraging of private investment, as mandated for the 2030 Sustainable Development Agenda by the Addis Ababa Action Agenda on Financing for Development, must continue and be amplified.

An assessment and removal of harmful incentives and regional and national roadmaps for their reform have to be established. Similarly, positive incentives to encourage and enable private investments must be strengthened, for example, by regulatory frameworks to reward private sector for safeguarding biodiversity. Appropriate indexes have to be defined to measure the impacts of investments on biodiversity in order to facilitate the choice of investors in favour of conservation and to unlock significant investment flows into biodiversity initiatives.

16. IUCN WCC, Marseille, June 2020

IUCN Commissions (WCPA and SSC) have established Task Forces to provide technical advice to the post 2020 process. IUCN's Council will establish a Task Force at their meeting in October.

The next IUCN World Conservation Congress will be hosted by France, 11 to 19 June at Parc Chanot in Marseille (<https://www.iucn.org/about/world-conservation-congress>). In 2019, IUCN will hold Regional Conservation Forums in all IUCN statutory regions to prepare for the Congress and discuss the new work Programme (2021 – 2014) of IUCN (that is intended to be a springboard for implementation of the post 2020 biodiversity framework); these will include dedicated sessions on the subject.