

15 December 2018

---

## Creating ambition and achieving it

**1. There is a need to develop a clearer understanding of the 2050 Vision for Biodiversity, and of exactly what such this implies for developing a post-2020 global biodiversity framework that will set the world on a pathway to realise the vision.**

This will require the following.

- a) Unpacking the 2050 vision as a basis for informing other actions.
- b) Identifying what needs to be achieved and can be achieved by 2030, and what needs to be achieved and can be achieved by 2040, as two milestones towards 2050. Based on this develop a post-2020 global biodiversity framework addressing both what needs to be achieved by 2030, and what needs to be place to promote and facilitate appropriate actions in future decades.
- c) Further identifying specific actions necessary for addressing drivers of biodiversity loss and “bending the curve” of biodiversity loss by 2030 drawing from scenarios and modelling approaches. This may also include undertaking a meta-analysis of these different studies to determine confidence and uncertainty in relation to the key actions required in order to progress on pathways towards the 2050 Vision, and identifying approaches (policy, legal and practical) necessary for facilitating and promoting these actions.
- d) Developing technical documents and communication materials to increase understanding of the 2050 vision and what is needed to achieve it as part of the communications surrounding development and adoption of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework.
- e) As the post-2020 global biodiversity framework is developed, comparing emerging ambitions to assumptions in the scenarios of plausible pathways to the 2050 vision in order to understand the extent to which ambition in the framework, and any associated national commitments match the necessary progress in the next decade for achieving the 2050 Vision for Biodiversity.
- f) In relation to area-based conservation measures, it will be essential to focus future ambition on effectiveness, equitable management, representivity, and connectivity, alongside any enhanced coverage targets - and as with other targets to ensure that baselines are in place (for example for OECMs/Conserved Areas) before targets are set to better understand what might be appropriate levels of ambition.

**2. The evidence from scenario analysis and modelling tells us that the 2050 Vision for Biodiversity is achievable, but that achieving it will require very significant transformational changes across various sectors of the economy and society – and unless such changes are implemented in the very near future, the loss of biodiversity will continue well beyond 2030.**

The implication of this is that the following will need to be addressed.

- a) Specify the constituency of change agents (such as governments, United Nations bodies, businesses, the finance community, international organizations, non-governmental organizations and civil society, citizens) that need to be involved in delivering the 2050 Vision for Biodiversity, and develop specific actions that would be expected of each of these groups to ‘bend the curve’ over the next 10 years, and better enables them to take such actions.
- b) Better understand and address how to effectively address the drivers of biodiversity loss that fall with constituents and in sectors beyond the perceived mandate of the Convention and its Protocols, but which are impacting on biodiversity and ecosystem services, so that issues such as the following can be successfully addressed: promotion of nature-based solutions in addressing climate change and land degradation; promotion of sustainable consumption and production for example through sustainable

public procurement; promotion of sustainable agricultural practices, and biodiversity-positive commodity supply chains; promotion of circular economy with reduced resource requirements, and waste; promotion of a sustainable bio-economy for example through expanding the uptake of natural capital accounting; promotion of sound chemicals management; promotion of a rapid transition to renewable energy; etc.

- c) Use scenario analysis and modelling to help outline the strategies that will build upon the contributions of biodiversity and ecosystem services to achieving sustainable development, and responding to the objectives of other major human endeavours relating to climate change, land degradation, health and food and water security. This will help inform negotiators on a range of possible or plausible biodiversity futures under various assumptions of political, technological, and socio-economic development, along with a range of policy or management options, exploring trajectories of biodiversity and ecosystem services into the future.
- d) In carrying out the activities above, engage from early on with institutions and organizations beyond the “usual suspects”, including building further relationships with multilateral agreements other than the biodiversity-related MEAs and the Rio Conventions, and expanding engagement with financial institutions and the private sector (and in particular industry associations), so that they become actively involved in both development and implementation of the post-2020 framework and any associated targets addressing their sectors.
- e) Consider Identifying (or promoting the identification and use of) “champion initiatives” led by member states that may generate transformative change for biodiversity outcomes, recognising that it's important to capture what's going on at national level and identify opportunities to support such initiatives. An example might be China’s approach to “Ecological Civilization” as a means to operationalize biodiversity mainstreaming across Government and society.

**3. Achieving transformative change will require a much higher level of ambition across governments, and other actors, which goes significantly beyond business-as-usual. Changes will need to be made within and beyond the Convention in order to achieve the necessary level and pace of transformative change.**

Developing the post-2020 global biodiversity framework will benefit from the following:

- a) Evidence on how national commitments, including those enshrined in NBSAPs, contribute to achieving both national and global goals would support the development of new approaches for promoting action by governments and other stakeholders. This would include developing improved approaches for monitoring, reporting and accountability, so that there is better understanding and transparency of commitments and strengthened mechanisms for accountability under the Convention.
- b) A review of experience from other sectors where transformational or systemic change has been achieved, in order to identify relevant lessons that can help promote the necessary action. For example, what has led to major positive outcomes in the health sector at national and international levels, and are there lessons that can be learnt?
- c) There is clear need to engage other sectors and stakeholders, including the finance and business communities, in helping to understand and define what is needed and how it can be achieved - in other words engaging those responsible for driving change in trying to identify the solutions.
- d) Exploration of options and taking a decision on the future of NBSAPs in the context of other national policy frameworks and plans developed for the implementation of other international agreements and processes. In this regard it may also be valuable to assessment current barriers to NBSAPs being integrated into national finance and development planning.
- e) Consideration of how to promote and facilitate development of innovative approaches at the national level for implementing biodiversity-related conventions and related multilateral treaties, including activities with an impact on biodiversity in areas beyond national jurisdiction.
- f) Recognising the efforts that some organizations are making to promote the concept of an “apex target”, consider whether it might be possible to develop and use one or more apex indicators as a basis for

communication, considering pros and cons of such an approach, and the pathway to determining or developing such indicators.

- g) The widescale promotion of natural capital accounting approaches, both at the national level (for example through the UN System of Environmental-Economic Accounting framework), and in the business sector through corporate accounting. National action could also be supported through national ecosystem assessment approaches that consider the role of biodiversity and ecosystem services across sectors.
- h) Recognizing the huge potential for restoration to meet biodiversity and wider sustainable development needs. Ambition beyond existing commitments (of 350 million hectares restored by 2030) could mitigate ongoing biodiversity loss in the short term whilst underlying drivers of biodiversity loss and unsustainable use are addressed.

### Engaging with multiple agendas

- 4. Significant benefits will be gained by taking actions to achieve the 2050 vision in the context of the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development and its Sustainable Development Goals, and the Paris Agreement under the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change, as these agendas are also explicitly concerned with transformational change.**

It is expected that this will require the international community to:

- a) Design the post-2020 global biodiversity framework so that it constitutes an essential element of the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development to achieve the Sustainable Development Goals, focusing not only on SDGs 13 and 14, but on the role of biodiversity in supporting delivering of the full range of SDGs and their component targets.
- b) Design the post-2020 global biodiversity framework so that it builds on countries' commitments under the Paris Agreement and contributes to achieving its objective through identifying and scaling up nature-based solutions.
- c) Ensure that there is a clear understanding of where there are co-benefits that can be promoted, and where there are potential trade-offs that might require due consideration, with respect to relationships between the Convention and its Protocols and these two instruments.

- 5. It is essential that the post-2020 global biodiversity framework becomes the global strategy for addressing concerns about biodiversity and ecosystem services, and this will require careful crafting to ensure the opportunities are fully explored for aligning interests with other international conventions and processes.**

In order to achieve this we will need to:

- a) Develop targets and implementation mechanisms that actively promote collaboration across the biodiversity-related conventions at all appropriate levels (recognising that a number of the conventions are already actively considering this).
- b) Develop a post-2020 global biodiversity framework that fosters close linkages between the three Rio Conventions, particularly with respect to implementation at the national level (noting the initiative being taken by Egypt in their role as COP President to promote this).
- c) Ensure that all actions related to drivers are developed in consultation with those intergovernmental agreements and processes working on those drivers (for example chemicals and waste conventions specifically the Strategic Approach to International Chemicals Management with respect to pollution targets).
- d) Recognise the importance of restoration across multiple agendas, and consider how to promote it in a collaborative manner.

- 6. A major strategy for achieving transformative change must be the enhanced implementation of the mainstreaming agenda that is already part of the CBD agenda, and is significantly supported by the Cancun Declaration and the Sharm El-Sheikh Declaration.**

This requires the post-2020 global biodiversity framework to:

- a) Explicitly address mainstreaming, and in doing so be conscious of the different priorities and interests implicit in other agendas and sectors, reaching out to stakeholders responsible for policy and action in those sectors, and developing approaches that are deliberately cross-sectoral.
- b) Explicitly recognise the significance of continuing to reach out to all relevant sectors, such as forestry, agriculture, fisheries, tourism, energy and mining, infrastructure, manufacturing and processing, and health, and in this regard use different types of language to speak to different stakeholders, working with partners and other stakeholder to amplify and contribute to messages.

## Delivering on what is intended

### **7. In order to more clearly respond to concerns about mandates, and what the Convention might and might not consider directly, consider targets and associated actions in several different categories, which may require different approaches to language and target setting.**

These might fall into four categories, as follows:

- a) Aspirational targets on what that Convention and its Protocols are trying to achieve with respect to biodiversity and ecosystem services.
  - b) Targets and milestones that address the tasks that the biodiversity community is able to address as it already has the mandate to do so (for example with respect to protected areas, wildlife management, ecosystem restoration, access and benefit-sharing, addressing invasive alien species, and so on).
  - c) Targets, milestones and actions that relate to interactions with other agendas, and address drivers of change that might be considered to be beyond the direct mandate of the Convention and its Protocols, and where additional approaches might be needed to foster synergies and coherence with related agenda and processes.
  - d) Enabling activities relating to resource mobilization, capacity building, technology transfer, information for decision making, and so on, which are essential for underpinning action to achieve other targets and milestones.
  - e) For simplified communications it might also be useful to categorize efforts in a framework into those that are addressing the causes of biodiversity loss, those that will make up for existing degradation of biodiversity (through restoration action), and those that will ensure the conservation and sustainable use of remaining biodiversity (for example through expansion of area-based conservation and efforts on management of species, populations and genetic resources).
- 8. As the post-2020 global biodiversity framework is developed, check regularly that the measures being proposed will result in desired outcomes, so that negotiators remain aware of progress towards success.**

This will require:

- a) Careful checking that the drafts of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework and preceding discussion papers cover all three objectives of the Convention, and the Protocols of the Convention.
- b) Use of scenario analysis and modelling at each step in the process to check that the range of measures being proposed will indeed set the world on a path to achieving the 2050 Vision. This will be important in helping to ensure that the post-2020 global biodiversity framework is both sufficiently ambitious, and will deliver the transformational change that is being called for.
- c) Scientific and knowledge-based analysis of individual targets and milestones to assess their likely effectiveness in addressing the issues on which they are focused. This will help negotiators in developing and refining targets and milestones, and will also provide valuable input to future technical descriptions.
- d) Use of lessons learnt from previous efforts to address the Aichi Biodiversity Targets in particular at the national level, including experience of interpreting targets for national use, and success stories that capture how national experiences can contribute to the post-2020 framework.

**9. In order to determine appropriate levels of ambition, and to track implementation from the outset, ensure indicators and baselines are in place as part of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework to be adopted, and its earlier drafts.**

In order to achieve this:

- a) Consider indicators and associated baselines as targets and milestones are developed, not retrospectively, and develop the indicator framework for adoption at the same time as the post-2020 global biodiversity framework.
- b) Develop associated guidance for Parties on the use of indicators in assessing progress in implementing the post-2020 global biodiversity framework, both building on the above-mentioned framework and drawing on review of the use of indicators at the national level as reporting on in the 6<sup>th</sup> National Reports.
- c) Develop associated guidance for the private sector to translate the indicators for corporate action and implementation.

**10. An effective review and reporting process needs to be in place when the post-2020 global biodiversity framework is adopted.**

In order to achieve this:

- a) Upscale the voluntary peer-review process and others, as the centrepiece of the multidimensional review approach recognized by the CBD COP-14 decision (in L.13).
- b) Update the national reporting format to increase consistency and continuity across the different reporting cycles up to 2030, including stronger links to headline indicators that are developed (and may include those adopted by CBD COP in decision XIII/28), and aiming for increased complementarity with reports provided by countries to other biodiversity-related multilateral environmental agreements (striving towards a modular reporting approach) as indicated by CBD COP in decision XIII/27 and by the COP-14 decision (in L.7).
- c) Promote use of online reporting tools and reporting and knowledge management tools such as the Data and Reporting Tool, consistent with the CBD COP-14 decision (in L.7) on the 'process for aligning national reporting, assessment and review'.
- d) Encourage the uptake of mechanisms for reporting progress within the private sector, both within the process outlined in the three points above, and through encouraging individual corporate reporting on biodiversity.

## **Ensuring that the necessary enabling activities are in place**

**11. It will be necessary to develop and agree new approaches to resource mobilization at the same time as the post-2020 global biodiversity framework is adopted to ensure the necessary financial resources are available for implementation.**

This responds to the CBD COP-14 decision (in L.33), and the means for achieving this are sufficiently outlined in the decision. This will need active management to ensure the processes are fully aligned.

**12. Capacity building needs to be considered alongside development of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework, to ensure that a strategic framework can be put in place for developing the necessary capacity for implementing the post-2020 global biodiversity framework**

This responds to CBD COP decisions XIII/23 and the Decision from CoP14 (in L.12) on the development of a long-term strategic framework for capacity-building beyond 2020, and the means for achieving this are sufficiently outlined in the decision including its annex. This will need active management to ensure the processes are fully aligned. One additional consideration is the potential value of building a theory of change for capacity-building up to 2030, working in cooperation with the GEF Secretariat, GEF agencies and other multilateral institutions.

**13. Both development of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework and its widespread adoption and implementation will require effective communication and outreach that substantially increases understanding of the multiple values of biodiversity and ecosystem services and the importance of increasing efforts to address the objectives of the Convention.**

This responds to the CBD COP-14 decision (in L.16) and the advance version of the decision on the post-2020 process. In order to achieve this:

- a) Design campaigns leading to 2020 that are mutually supportive and coherent across organizations, recognising that while it will be valuable for messages to be aligned, they do not all need to be the same. This should include developing mutually supporting messaging across biodiversity-related conventions and organizations, and the Rio Conventions.
- b) As part of these campaigns, make effective use of key events of international relevance, including the meetings of the World Economic Forum, Agricultural meetings, the UN Environment Assembly, the UN General Assembly, IPBES Plenaries, CMS and CITES CoPs, the IUCN World Conservation Congress, and so on. In this regard there is great value in further promoting the Post-2020 Strategic Planning Timeline (<https://post2020.unep-wcmc.org/>) to identify relevant events and as a resource for identifying outcomes.
- c) As already recognised in the CBD COP-14 decision (in L.30), it is important to increase “awareness about the multiple values of biodiversity and the consequences of biodiversity loss through enhanced communication”, and there are opportunities to use the results of scenarios and modelling to do so, as well as IPBES assessments and ongoing IPBES work on the multiple values of biodiversity.

**The following documents developed by UNEP working in collaboration with others also form part of this submission**

- 14. CBD/SBSTTA/21/INF/2/Rev.1 on review of future projections of biodiversity and ecosystem services** which addresses the issue of the relevance of recent projections for achieving the 2050 vision on biodiversity, and was updated for COP at the request of SBSTTA. *This information document and the work that it described is important for a number of reasons, including informing the level of ambition and potential content of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework, and contributing to communications.*
- 15. CBD/SBI/2/INF/33 on effective use of knowledge in developing the post-2020 global biodiversity framework** is the output from an international expert workshop explicitly focused on identifying what evidence those developing the post-2020 global biodiversity framework might need in order to inform their work. *As such it both identifies existing sources of evidence and potential gaps that might be addressed in both the evidence itself and the ways in which it is presented.*
- 16. CBD/COP/14/INF/40 on developing indicators for the post-2020 global biodiversity framework: lessons from the Biodiversity Indicators Partnership** sets out a number of lessons that are relevant both to target setting and to the need to develop indicators as an integral part of the process of developing the post-2020 global biodiversity framework. *The recommendations from this information document have been expanded in the light of discussions in the margins of COP-14, and these are annexed to this submission.*

## Annex: Developing indicators for the post-2020 global biodiversity framework

Following input sought from its 60 partners, the Biodiversity Indicators Partnership submitted an information document to COP 14 entitled *Developing indicators for the post-2020 global biodiversity framework: Lessons from the Biodiversity Indicators Partnership* (CBD/COP/14/INF/40). In the margins of COP14 a side event was held to elicit further views from Parties and other bodies. This note takes the input from this event and the recommendations from the information document, and provides a further iteration of **recommendations for the scope of the indicator component of the post 2020 framework**.

- a) Post-2020 targets should be as SMART as possible to allow for the identification of clear and useful indicators. The establishment of SMART targets will help to improve alignment and relevance of indicators to the appropriate target. Time-bound targets will also allow indicators to more closely track progress towards targets.
- b) As per the experience of the BIP using the Biodiversity Indicator Development Framework at sub-national, national and global scales, the development of targets and indicators should be an iterative process, with the identification of indicators helping to refine the targets. This is consistent with the recommendation from COP to develop targets and indicators in parallel.
- c) While it is important to build on what already exists, the lack of a known existing indicator should not limit target development. From the experience of the BIP secretariat, it is still possible to identify datasets and indicators of which we were previously unaware, and there is often ongoing work that, with minimal support, could provide a new and innovative indicator ready for use. The EU-funded *Mind the Gap* project identified three new indicators ready for global use, and 39 indicators either under active development or requiring further development before being ready for global use. Under the same project, three new indicators were developed to fill gaps in the existing indicator framework for the Aichi Biodiversity Targets.
- d) While the target terminology adopted within the post-2020 global biodiversity framework has not yet been defined, efforts should continue to identify and mobilise indicators which can track actions as well as outcomes. Indicators which can track actions, policy responses and policy uptake, and the success of enabling mechanisms will be required, including resource mobilisation, capacity building and mainstreaming metrics (see for example decision CBD/COP/14/L20) which references the need for mainstreaming metrics).
- e) Any voluntary national biodiversity commitments to be developed under the CBD should ideally be developed by countries making use of an agreed common framework, to facilitate and enable informed and effective conservation action, monitoring, and reporting, and to enable collective commitments and ambition to be determined in relation to global goals and targets.
- f) New technologies should be employed to track and communicate progress on the targets more dynamically and continually in the future, using indicator visualization platforms and model-based scenarios to support an adaptive management approach that allows for continual improvements and feedback to actions to meet the targets.
- g) In particular, the creation of a post-2020 target tracker could ensure that measurable and meaningful indicators are available from the start, to track progress toward achievement of the post-2020 targets. The target tracker could show the agreed targets and their associated date stamped indicator updates at national and global levels using the kind of visualisation now online through the Biodiversity Indicators Dashboard, using both historic trend data and where available any forward extrapolations or modelled data to show the timeframe between 2020 and 2030. Such a system could also integrate the scenario models being developed for IPBES to allow Parties and others the ability to explore and visualize alternative futures and pathways towards the targets and the 2050 Vision for Biodiversity. The target tracker would also fulfil a role in ensuring transparency and visibility of indicator data to promote trust and confidence in the underpinning sources.
- h) A review of the use of indicators by Parties in their 6th National Reports would help to reinforce use of indicators at the national level in the post-2020 period.