

**TEMPLATE FOR COMMENTS AND ADDITIONAL VIEWS ON THE PROPOSALS FOR A
COMPREHENSIVE AND PARTICIPATORY PROCESS FOR THE PREPARATION OF THE POST-2020
GLOBAL BIODIVERSITY FRAMEWORK**

Contact information		
Surname:	Peña Moreno	
Given Name:	Sonia	
Government (if applicable):		
Organization:	IUCN- International Union for Conservation of Nature	
E-mail:	sonia.penamoreno@iucn.org	
Comments on the draft proposals		
Page #	Para #	Comment
0	0	IUCN presents inputs and observations for consideration. These build on and are complementary to those already presented to the Secretariat and contained in IUCN's submission of September 2017. IUCN would like to stress that in making suggestions for consideration regarding the process for the preparation of the post 2020 global biodiversity framework, focus on implementation efforts towards meeting the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020 and its Aichi Targets must continue. Recent analyses demonstrate that in aggregate around the world, the state of biodiversity is deteriorating and pressures facing it are increasing. As a result, the few available indicators of the benefits that biodiversity provides to people show deteriorations. The only positive trends emerge for indicators of conservation responses, which generally show increases, which is great news. Nevertheless it is evident that these efforts are not yet sufficient to mitigate increasing pressures on biodiversity and they must be scaled-up and strengthened considerably. IUCN recalls, however, that the state of biodiversity would be much worse in the absence of conservation actions to date and recognizes that the current Strategic Plan for Biodiversity has many strengths - a great deal for biodiversity conservation has been achieved following its adoption-.
5	IV. Other Considerations	IUCN is of the view that the issues covered in paragraphs 18-22 in section IV are extremely important and would merit further detail and expansion.
5	18	As a new post-2020 biodiversity framework is developed, IUCN agrees that the Sustainable Development Goals provide an important enabling framework and that any new framework for biodiversity must be aligned to them. Moreover, IUCN is of the view that we must see the 2030 Agenda for

		Sustainable Development as an opportunity. It is clear that the goals of the Strategic Plan and the Aichi Targets have already “influenced” the SDG framework and that they won’t be lost after a new global biodiversity framework post-2020 is agreed. A specific effort is needed to ensure that the scope of the goals of the current Strategic Plan are compared with the overall ambition of the SDGs and aligned where necessary. However, the SDGs whose targets are built on the Strategic Plan and Aichi Targets should ultimately be updated, strengthened and meaningfully taken up in the SDG process (beyond SDG14 & 15) for the decade 2021-2030. IUCN highlights that there are important questions to address when considering the interlinkages between the SDGs and the biodiversity framework, for instance: - What must be done for biodiversity conservation to achieve the SDGs? - What are the synergies and trade-offs (intact nature delivering ecosystem goods and services, biodiversity conservation and delivery of SDGs)? and - How can the SDGs be implemented in a biodiversity “conscious manner”? It is also important to note that a high level of ambition for nature conservation will be necessary to achieve the SDGs
5	19	IUCN considers that it is essential to establish linkages with other relevant processes and agreements including but not limited to the biodiversity-related MEAs. IUCN thus welcomes the mentioning of these processes in paragraph 19.
5	20	IUCN does not disagree with the relevance of the 2050 Vision but we consider that asserting that the 2050 Vision of the Strategic Plan <i>will remain relevant for the Convention and its Protocols after 2020</i> pre-empts the discussions to be held and ultimately the decision that the Parties to the Convention are expected take at COP14 to translate the 2050 Vision into more tangible terms. IUCN considers that a long-term Vision for biodiversity conservation needs to be an enabling ‘call to action’. The Vision should communicate why the conservation of biodiversity matters to people and is essential for sustainable development.
6	21	This is an extremely important paragraph that would deserve further explanation and elaboration. How would ongoing work to strengthen implementation support mechanisms and review of implementation be also relevant for the post-2020 biodiversity framework and other processes?
6	22	This is an extremely important paragraph that would deserve further elucidation. (See comments on paragraph 35 below)
7	28	There is a need to substantially enhance coherence and cooperation between the CBD (and its Protocols), the other two Rio Conventions, and the other biodiversity-related conventions. IUCN calls for further consideration of the ways in which these conventions and processes can contribute to the design and planning of the next biodiversity plan so that there is genuine buy-in from their own constituencies and the new framework (and targets) reflect priorities, concerns and potential solutions within those agreements (and not only “respond” to CBD Parties).

		IUCN recommends that an open invitation is made for these MEAs to take active part and submit inputs at various stages of the process of development of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework.
7	30	IUCN is of the view that there is no such thing as a “scientific target” but rather that targets are socio-political choices that often result from negotiations and compromises. IUCN agrees that there is value in the process of developing the post-2020 framework <i>being informed by relevant scientific understanding relating to targets and target setting, including the understanding of the implications of not reaching particular targets, and the use of models to explore potential impacts of different scenarios.</i> IUCN welcomes the growing use of scenarios and modelling to better inform discussions and ultimately, sound biodiversity management decisions. Assessments of scenarios and models of biodiversity and ecosystem services are powerful tools that not only advise on policymaking in a myriad of contexts but also point out to gaps in scientific information and technical capacities so that adequate response measures can be explored to fulfil them. IUCN considers however that in the design of the new global biodiversity framework the use of scenarios and modelling should be complemented by efforts to continue strengthening tools and mechanisms that at present support implementation of goals and targets by providing a solid information base (e.g. indicators to track progress, monitoring tools...) to contribute to a fair understanding of the current conditions and the state of biodiversity.
10	39 (d)	IUCN has been supportive of the development of “science-based targets”. We note nevertheless, that the term “science-based targets” is being used in widely different ways and this is generating substantial confusion. Moreover, IUCN considers that it is useful not only to understand what “science-based” means in relation to “science-based targets”, but also to differentiate between “overall science-based targets” and “specific science-based targets”. In order to better understand what science-based targets entail, IUCN puts forward the following characteristics: - For a target to be science-based, it must be <u>theoretically achievable</u> (the evidence suggests that the target is a biophysical possibility within the specified time-frame); - The target should be <u>quantified</u>, such that progress towards it is measurable, and that a requirement to measure and report progress quantitatively is incorporated; and - The target should be <u>supported by a clear, analytical rationale</u> for why the target is set at this particular level.
0	0	IUCN notes that there is no explicit mention in this draft for consultation on the Mission for 2030 or the process that will lead to its agreement presumably before COP15 in 2020. IUCN believes that it is essential that clarity is provided from the outset about how this process will go about. Discussing and agreeing on a new Mission for 2030 is as relevant as deciding on the 2050 Vision. Specifically regarding the Mission, based on the above understanding of science-based targets, and reinforcing what IUCN mentioned in our previous

		submission (September 2017), IUCN proposes some elements to be considered for the scope and content of a new Mission for 2030 within a global biodiversity framework: positive, succinct, action-oriented, bold, ambitious, and 'quotable'. We stress that the Mission needs to be specific and measurable by focusing on the component parts of the definition of biodiversity (i.e. species, ecosystems, genetic diversity) and evidence-based (ideally an equivalent of the 2°C/1.5°C temperature rise cap agreed under Paris Climate Change Agreement). The Mission must link clearly and discernibly to the Vision.
8,9	33-37	IUCN agrees that there may be useful lessons to learn from the experience of the UNFCCC process in developing the Paris Agreement but equally from other processes. Knowing that the <u>Paris Agreement</u> is still very recent and acknowledging that its ultimate goal has not been achieved and climate change is still a reality good lessons could be extracted from: 1) The <u>process</u> culminating in the adoption of the Paris Agreement: good public engagement (including private sector in the aftermath of the Stern Report); high political visibility; and uptake of the scientific evidence in the decision-making process to name a few. 2) Key <u>elements of the goal itself (2°)</u>: simple, quantifiable, periodic review, for all countries. 3) "<u>Agenda solutions</u>" & <u>wide engagement of non- State actors/civil society</u> at large - including the private sector (the Non-State Actors Zone for Climate Action (NAZCA) lists over 11,000 commitments from these actors)-. 4) <u>NDCs</u>: Under Paris, each country commits to outline and communicate their post-2020 climate actions, known as their Nationally Determined Contributions, NDCs. When put together, these climate actions determine whether the world achieves the long-term goals of the Paris Agreement or not. Some open questions remain: How would "NDCs for biodiversity" look like? What would the process to develop them entail? What could be the process to get to their adoption? Can NBSAPs be transformed to incorporate some of the features of the NDCs? IUCN welcomes serious consideration of this approach at the July 2018 meeting of the Subsidiary Body on Implementation or at the very latest by CBD COP14 in November 2018. This 'bottom up'/ 'voluntary' approach could, if designed carefully, help transform the political landscape of the CBD in a more positive direction by promoting country-led action and collaboration, and provide a more productive template for international/N-S cooperation on biodiversity conservation in the post-2020 period. Likewise, putting in place a rules-based process for conducting 'global stocktakes' to monitor progress on implementation against agreed global biodiversity targets at period intervals, and for countries to periodically enhance global ambition and action over time, should be considered. Such an approach would also have the benefit of harmonising the Rio Conventions and, ideally, create common reporting frameworks that would maximise synergies and minimise national reporting burdens. Similarly, the CBD could also have useful lessons to take from the Global Climate

		Action/Marrakech Partnership process to more systematically engage, and take into account the efforts of, non-state actors in contributing to greater biodiversity conservation action on the ground. Good lessons could also be extracted from experiences under other processes, for instance: <u>The Montreal Protocol</u> which is widely considered as the most successful environment protection agreement to date. The Protocol <u>sets out a mandatory timetable for the phase out of ozone depleting substances</u>. This timetable has been reviewed regularly, with phase out dates accelerated in accordance with scientific understanding and technological advances.
		<u>The Universal Periodic Review (UPR) under the auspices of the Human Rights Council</u> is a unique process which involves a review of the human rights records of all UN Member States. The UPR is a State-driven process, which aims to improve the human rights situation in all countries and address human rights violations wherever they occur. The mechanism is designed to ensure equal treatment for every country when their human rights situations are assessed.
9,10	38-39	Key elements (principals) – based on the analysis of what has worked and what has not worked within the biodiversity regime but also in other processes (including those mentioned above) - should be considered in the global biodiversity framework as discussions move forward. • The global biodiversity framework must be conversant with the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development; • It must adopt an approach which sets global time-bound goals (“science-based targets”) including the adoption of a simple overall science-based target (Mission); • It must establish an iterative (phased) commitment process for all (which evolves as scientific and technological progress is made); • It reflects a bottom-up approach (voluntary commitments & “peer-to-peer review”) to increase compliance and ownership; • It makes use of an open and transparent global monitoring and tracking mechanism (with periodic stock-taking); and • It provides for the creation of a platform for commitments to be made beyond States (all stakeholders).
13-16	Annex	IUCN recommends that for each event/activity listed (Tables 1 and 3) the name/title of each entry is followed by a short explanation to facilitate understanding. Currently some activities/events follow this format (usually for official meetings like SBSTTAs, SBIs, COPs) but it would be beneficial to have more context about some other entries (e.g. Regional Consultation Workshops – December –May 2019), Global policy consultation workshop – February 2020, etc)
16	Table 3	2019- IPBES7- correct April 2019; UNGA 74- correct September 2019
16	Table 3	IUCN Regional Conservation Forums – add “in preparation of IUCN’s World Conservation Congress in 2020”; add “throughout 2019”; and add “IUCN statutory regions”
16	Table 4	1st event should read: “Symposium- Safeguarding space for nature and securing our future: developing a post-2020 strategy”, hosted by ZSL and

		National Geographic Society in partnership with IUCN, BirdLife International/RSPB, UNEP-WCMC and the Secretariat of the CBD; dates: 27-28 February, 2018. 2nd event listed should read: "Cambridge Conservation Initiative /CCI Expert workshop - Framing the Future for Biodiversity Planning"; co-organized by the Cambridge Conservation Initiative partnership which includes UNEP-WCMC, IUCN, RSPB/BirdLife International, and Cambridge University in collaboration with others including the Secretariat of CBD; 10-12 April, 2018, Cambridge, UK
--	--	---