

**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:	Obrecht	
Given Name:	Andreas	
Organization:	UN Environment	
E-mail:	andreas.obrecht@un.org	
Comments on the draft proposals		
Page #	Para #	Comment
0	0	It is important that relevant conventions and organizations decide timely on their engagement and involvement. It might be necessary for some governing bodies of them to take respective decisions/resolutions prior to 2020 so that their secretariats and/or organisations have a strong mandate to engage. This is something that could be discussed, better sooner than later, by the Liaison Group of Biodiversity-related Conventions.
7	29	The document could elaborate a bit more how future work of IPBES could be the most useful in a post 2020 global biodiversity framework. It is important that the future work of IPBES is responding to – and is part of – a post 2020 global biodiversity framework and the needs of all biodiversity-related conventions in that regard.
8	35	Regarding a process analogous to the National Determined Contribution process under the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change or Land Degradation Neutrality Voluntary Targets Setting under the United Nations Convention to Combat Desertification, an analysis of the factors allowing for it needs to be done: Resources (including negotiation time) invested at global level, preconditions (existing MRV mechanisms) and resources available for now implementing the process. It should be also evaluated whether it is likely that such a process would have stronger impact on the ground than the current process with national level targets and action plans and what the difference would be. In fact, the NBSAP process was already allowing for flexibility and adapting targets to national circumstances.
8	36	While indeed views on focus and scope of the post-2020 global biodiversity should be sought, it is important to proceed swiftly to analysis of shortcomings of the current system and where the COP will need to pay more attention to. Maybe it should be also distinguished between rather technical work, such as the identification of baselines, and the political ambition-setting.
8	36	Technical work on biodiversity monitoring and observation, indicators, reporting frameworks should be done in parallel to the more political party-led discussions. One approach could be to establish an Ad Hoc Technical Expert Group (AHTEG) with subgroups for major thematic areas. As usual practise for AHTEGs, the subgroups would also include both government and other experts. Partner organizations could be invited to manage these subgroups. These groups could be tasked to evaluate the current Aichi Biodiversity Targets and the experiences gained (good practises, gaps, weaknesses) with baselines, indicators, reporting and related development. The report of this AHTEG could provide a major input to the development of a post 2020 framework.

9 and 14	37	The head of state biodiversity summit should be organized timely before the COP-15 in order to have a significant impact on the negotiations, especially in terms of level of ambition. One month prior to the COP-15 might be good in terms of visibility but will the short time available to the COP will make it more challenging for governments to reflect outcomes of this summit in the development of their respective positions.
9	37	An implementation plan for post-2020 should consider realistic government processes and be designed in the light of the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development and Sustainable Development Goals. A discussion on the status of NBSAP implementation and expectations from governments how to proceed with them could clarify the directions preparations of a post-2020 global biodiversity framework could take.
9	38	There are some lessons learned, for instance: Baselines should be established for all targets, targets which were 'smart'-er were getting more attention, the 'resource mobilization' reporting framework is of high quality and indicators should be adopted together with the targets to allow the definition of baselines. Technical work, for instance by members of the Biodiversity Indicators Partnership should be encouraged.