

New Zealand submission on the post-2020 biodiversity framework

New Zealand welcomes the opportunity to contribute at this early stage to the formation of a post-2020 biodiversity framework, and looks forward to ongoing opportunities over the next two years.

New Zealand believes the framework should be formulated with impact in mind. This means the new goals will need to retain a level of ambition similar to that of the Aichi Biodiversity Targets. Other ways to achieve impact might include systems to ensure that progress is properly monitored and reported. It would be useful if, as part of this process, key indicators are determined alongside the new goals. To this end, we encourage collaboration with multilateral bodies and processes that have experience in developing and applying biodiversity-related indicators, such as the UN Food and Agriculture Organisation and the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development.

Impact also means that states should be encouraged to identify actions or goals where they can achieve the most meaningful gains for biodiversity. As was the case for the Aichi Targets, Parties should focus on goals that are highly relevant to the achievement of significant biodiversity outcomes in their territories and regions, or globally. States, non-parties, and other actors should have flexibility in the pursuit of the goals and objectives, with the aim of ensuring that significant biodiversity gains can be made.

As it is critical that the new framework supports and generates impact at national, regional, and global levels, the values and importance of biodiversity and the Convention on Biological Diversity will need to be mainstreamed into the practices and decisions of not just government agencies and stakeholders who are directly involved in environment and conservation work, but all government agencies, private sector, indigenous peoples, civil society, stakeholders, and the public, who have an impact on nature through their decisions or actions. The new framework must be constructed in a way that generates buy-in from sectors that are known to be heavily reliant on, and have significant impact on, biodiversity, such as those addressed by mainstreaming decisions at COPs 13 and 14. To this end, collaboration with relevant sector-focused multilateral initiatives such as the FAO's Mainstreaming Platform and WHO's One Health Initiatives are key.

It is possible that the Aichi Biodiversity Targets did not generate as much wide spread public support and political buy-in as they might have is the absence of a simple, clear apex goal (such as exists in the climate change space). The "mission" statement of the Strategic Plan lacks simplicity and clarity.

Communication will be an important facet of the post-2020 biodiversity framework, and it will be important that the new framework/goals can be easily communicated to policy makers, the private sector, civil society, indigenous peoples, and the wider public who are not as familiar with biodiversity issues. It is important that this communication

material is not weighed down with highly technical, legal, policy or management language.

If there is to be a number of goals, as there was with the Aichi Biodiversity Targets, these could be clustered, but only if these clusters are coherent and meaningful. The Strategic Goals are not worded in a way that makes immediate impact, and as a result tend to be overlooked. A similar situation should be avoided for the post-2020 framework.