

**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**

<b>Contact information</b>		
<b>Surname:</b>	Friedrich	
<b>Given Name:</b>	Wulf	
<b>Government (if applicable):</b>		
<b>Organization:</b>	Pro Natura - Friends of the Earth Switzerland	
<b>E-mail:</b>	Friedrich.Wulf@pronatura.ch	
<b>Comments on the draft proposals</b>		
<b>Page #</b>	<b>Para #</b>	<b>Comment</b>
5	18	While we would agree that there is consistency between the Aichi targets and the 2030 Agenda, some of the elements of the Aichi targets are not reflected in the 2030 Agenda, at least not to the level of specificity the Aichi targets have. For example, Aichi target 15 aims at restoring at least 15% of degraded ecosystems, in order to combat climate change mitigation, while SDG 1 mentions degradation without mentioning numbers or being linked to climate change mitigation. Target 17, not surprisingly, is not included in the 2030 Agenda at all. We would therefore suggest not to say “virtually all” of the elements of the Aichi Biodiversity targets are reflected in the 2030 Agenda, but “almost all”.
6	24	We would like to stress the first two sentences of the para, that many submissions support the view that the post 2020 framework should continue to serve as a framework for universal action on biodiversity. Regarding issues not currently covered by the Aichi targets, we are convinced that the Aichi targets are very comprehensive and would warn not to extend the strategic plan to topics that are cross-cutting or not directly linked to the CBD’s objectives as the plan might lose focus, and biodiversity-specific issues would be less prominent.
6	25	We welcome the conclusion that the preparatory process needs to be inclusive, transparent and clear.
7	27	As stated in our first comment, the 2030 Agenda is in general well aligned with the Aichi targets. However, some elements are either less precise or ambitious, while others are missing. The Post-2020 Biodiversity targets and the 2030 Agenda should be completely aligned, but this would need to be mutual, so the exclusive elements of either are reflected in both. If it is only the Aichi targets that are aligned to the 2030 agenda, we could lose important content.
8	34	We would support and underline the need for an effective review process or even to adopt a binding compliance mechanism to ensure that the future strategic plan will be implemented.

9	37	Thank you for raising the time lag issue, which is indeed a reason why the post-2020 strategic framework should try to limit changes to its predecessor. Compatibility is important in order not to disrupt ongoing implementation and reporting procedures. We welcome the suggestions for parties to adopt their national frameworks already ahead of the formal adoption of the post 2020 strategic framework.
9	38	We agree on building the post-2020 framework on what was done previously
9-10	39	We support the overarching principles.
10	40	We support the activities.
11	43	We suggest to add the following Key information sources to the list: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Voluntary peer reviews under the CBD</li> <li>- OECD environmental performance review, as applicable</li> </ul> The latter provide an important, well recognized perspective on environmental policy in the countries concerned. The Swiss environmental peer review which was published only last month is an important reference for the state of biodiversity in Switzerland which can well be used to inform the state of implementation of the CBD strategic plan, especially as it clearly pinpoints existing gaps rather than describing activities taken.
13	Annex, Table 1	We agree with the process in general and are happy to see there are several opportunities to give online input, first on a general basis and then as comments to different drafts. However, none of these can take the outputs of GBO-5 into account – it would be good if GBO-5 could happen earlier and it is vital to have the draft GBO-5 ready in November as foreseen, so at least the draft can be used for the online consultation.
	Annex, Table 1	Leader’s summit – this happens towards the end of the process and it is unclear how it is linked to drafting process. It would be important to specify how this intended, for the sake of transparency and understanding the process.
15	Annex, Table 3	There is no mention of the Trondheim conference in the table. The 2010 Trondheim conference had provided valuable input into the development of the present CBD strategic plan, and we would expect Norway to stage a similar conference this time too.
16	Annex, Table 3	The date for ipbes-7 is indicated as April 2018 – shouldn’t it be 2019?
		Additional rows can be added to this table by selecting “Table” followed by “insert” and “rows below”

Please submit your comments to [secretariat@cbd.int](mailto:secretariat@cbd.int) or by fax at +1 514 288 6588 by **4 January 2018**