



Ms. Elizabeth Maruma Mrema
Officer-in-Charge
Secretariat of the Convention on Biological Diversity
United Nations Environment Programme
E-mail: secretariat@cbd.int

December 6, 2019

Dear Ms. Mrema,

In response to CBD Notification 2019-086 "Call for evidence on Resource Mobilization", Canada is pleased to provide our input to the survey via annex I to the current document. We look forward to being further engaged in discussions on this important topic at the Thematic workshop on resource mobilization for the post-2020 global biodiversity framework which will be held in Berlin, Germany from 14 to 16 of January, 2020.

Best regards,

Basile van Havre
CBD National Focal Point

Basile van Havre
Director General for the Biodiversity Policy
and Partnerships Directorate
Canadian Wildlife Service
Environment and Climate Change Canada
351 St-Joseph
Gatineau, QC
K1A 0H3
Canada
Telephone +1 819 938 3935

Basile van Havre
Directeur Général des politiques et des
partenariats sur la biodiversité
Service Canadien de la Faune
Environnement et Changement Climatique
Canada
351 St-Joseph
Gatineau, QC
K1A 0H3
Canada
Téléphone +1 819 938 3935



Annex I

QUESTIONNAIRE

- (a) Please provide your evaluation of the structure, content and effectiveness of the Strategy for Resource Mobilization adopted by decision IX/11,¹ indicating as much as possible the gaps in meeting the targets.
- (b) Please provide a summary of your experiences in achieving Aichi Biodiversity Target 20 and implementing the Strategy for Resource Mobilization, and their adequacy, and your views on the need for appropriate further action.

Canada's replies to questions (a) and (b) above are provided in accordance with the goals of the Strategy for Resource Mobilization.

GOAL 1: IMPROVE INFORMATION BASE ON FUNDING NEEDS, GAPS AND PRIORITIES

A. Evaluation of structure, content and effectiveness of Goal 1

The Strategy for Resource Mobilization (the "Strategy") was established at COP-9. At CBD COP-10, Parties agreed to establish targets for the Strategy, "provided that robust baselines have been identified and endorsed and that an effective reporting framework has been adopted". The targets and the CBD Financial Reporting Framework were subsequently developed and adopted at COPs-11 and 12. Data provided under the preliminary reporting framework, for the 2006-2010, served as a baseline to monitor progress on whether the resource mobilization targets.

'Improving the information base' is therefore the main *raison d'être* for the CBD Financial Reporting Framework. In addition, 'funding needs' are determined through the regular needs assessment process conducted every four years, prior to the replenishment process of the Global Environment Facility (GEF). The expert panel conducting the 2nd needs assessment for COP-13 made use of National Reports, NBSAPs, Financial Reports, Resource Mobilization Strategies, and other documents. 'Priorities' have been established through the targets under decision XII/3, as well as Guidance to the financial mechanism (i.e., the GEF). 'Gaps' are identified as part of the above-mentioned processes.

In addition, the GEF, which operates the CBD's financial mechanism, provides regular reporting to each CBD COP; has its own Independent Evaluation Office to assess its performance, and is subject to regular review regarding the COP's effectiveness evaluation of the financial mechanism.

Evaluation of Goal 1: The Strategy represents consensus among CBD Parties on an approach to resource mobilization. Developed in 2008, it is generally sound in structure and content. With the important addition of CBD Decision XII/3 targets and the Financial Reporting Framework, and information provided by CBD needs assessments, GEF, BIOFIN and others, the essential tools are in place to meet all the key elements of Goal 1.

¹ <https://www.cbd.int/doc/decisions/cop-09/cop-09-dec-11-en.pdf>



With respect to the effectiveness of Goal 1, overall it has been limited. Only about half of Parties are reporting information on financing; a minority of eligible recipient Parties are reporting on their needs and priorities; and less than the minimum 75% of Parties are reporting on targets. Further, there is a lack of consistency in reporting that makes it difficult to roll-up data into a comprehensive information base. That said, over time the number of Parties reporting is increasing.

A more detailed breakdown of Canada's review of the effectiveness of the various components of Goal 1 is provided below:

- **Effectiveness of providing information:** With 10-plus years of experience implementing the Strategy, the effectiveness of Goal 1 is limited (albeit slowly improving), due primarily to the fact that not all Parties are reporting under the financial reporting framework, despite agreeing to under COP decisions, or towards the needs assessment, despite the opportunity to identify country needs for capacity building and support, leaving gaps in the information base, and limiting the basis for a comprehensive assessment of progress. Since the establishment of the Financial Reporting Framework, Parties have 'noted with concern' that the information submitted to the Framework was insufficient. In fact, even by COP-14 in 2018, only 79 of 196 Parties (40%) submitted such reports.
- **Effectiveness of achieving the Strategy's Targets:** In assessing achievement of the Targets under CBD Decision XII/3, it is important to bear in mind that Parties also agreed that: all targets are to be considered mutually supportive; and that they should all be advancing at generally the same pace. Despite the information gaps, progress is slowly being made against the targets for resource mobilization, varying by target.
 - **Regarding target 1(a),** the majority of donor Parties (23 out of the 30 DAC members) and 7 non-DAC members have provided information on resources to support biodiversity actions in developing countries. The strategy has been effective on bilateral donor funding, in that "donor countries that are party to the CBD collectively doubled their biodiversity-related funding and increased their expenditure by 130% from the baseline [2006-2010] to 2015." [WWF] and thus meeting the Aichi 20 target of increasing funding substantially from the current levels, from all sources. The strategy has been partly effective in multilateral funding through the financial mechanism, in that the GEF has increased biodiversity funding by 130% between GEF-4 and GEF-7 [WWF]. Nonetheless, the biodiversity focal point is the largest in GEF-7, while total GEF funding has been stable since GEF-5, and even decreased in GEF-7.
 - **Regarding target 1(b) to 1(d):** these targets have not been met by 2015, although slow progress is being made. Less than 75 per cent of Parties have reported on: Target (b) on including biodiversity in national priorities / development plans by 2015; Target (c) on reporting on domestic biodiversity expenditures, as well as funding needs, gaps and priorities; and Target (d) on preparing national financial plans for biodiversity by 2015.
 - **Regarding Target 1 (e)** on mobilization of domestic financial resources, this target does not have a 2015 timeline, but does not seem likely to be met by its 2020 date.
- **Effectiveness of providing an overall financial picture:** Further limiting effectiveness, is that it seems difficult to compare data received under the financial reporting framework, in order to provide a cumulative picture of resources mobilized at different levels – international, regional and national. For example, WWF-Germany found a continued lack of consistency and uniformity in reporting under the Framework [WWF]. This could prove an ongoing challenge for post-2020 work, in that we should expect that the current financial reporting framework is able to provide a strong baseline for the coming years – but unfortunately, this does not seem to be the case.



- **Effectiveness of identifying needs and priorities:** The effectiveness of identification of developing countries' needs and priorities is also limited, again due to lack of information from relevant Parties. Under the financial reporting framework, 38 reporting Parties (close to 50 per cent) indicated their estimated funding need, typically based on the revised NBSAP. A total of 21 countries, or close to 30 per cent, also indicated actions for priority funding. Parties also have an opportunity to identify their funding needs through the needs assessment conducted prior to the GEF replenishment process. However, similar to the experience of the Financial Reporting Framework, not all potential recipient Parties are doing so. The experts conducting the second needs assessment concluded that: "only 42% (or 60 countries of the 143 GEF recipient countries) responded with total project costs, co-financing amounts, and expected funding needs from GEF-7. Only 18 GEF-recipient countries submitted their funding needs by the extended 2016 deadline." The expert panel also noted: "a comprehensive and robust GEF funding needs assessment relies heavily on input from GEF recipient countries. The results of future assessments can only be improved if recipient countries continue and further intensify their active engagement in this task" [UNEP/CBD/COP/13/12/Add.2]

Evaluation of Goal 1.2 This sub-goal has been positive and successful, as a significant number of studies have been undertaken by intergovernmental organizations, such as OECD, GEF, UNDP and UNEP, as well as non-governmental and academic papers, to assess the economic costs of the loss of biodiversity and its associated ecosystem services and the benefits of action. Among them are, by date:

- Cooper, G. and Trémolet S. (2019). Investing in Nature: Private Finance for Nature-based Resilience. The Nature Conservancy and Environmental Finance. London, UK.
- IPBES (2019) Global Assessment Report
- OECD (2019), Biodiversity: Finance and the Economic and Business Case for Action, report prepared for the G7 Environment Ministers' Meeting, 5-6 May 2019.
- OECD (2018), Tracking Economic Instruments and Finance for Biodiversity, <http://www.oecd.org/environment/resources/Tracking-Economic-Instruments-and-Finance-for-Biodiversity.pdf>.
- UNDP (2018), The BIOFIN Workbook 2018: Finance for Nature, United Nations Development Programme
- WWF, Germany (2018). Barometer on CBD's Strategy for Resource Mobilization.
- OECD (2013), Scaling-up Finance Mechanisms for Biodiversity, OECD Publishing, Paris, <https://dx.doi.org/10.1787/9789264193833-en>.
- Parker, C. et al. (2012), The Little Biodiversity Finance Book: A guide to proactive investment in natural capital (PINC), Global Canopy Programme.
- TEEB (2010), The Economics of Ecosystems and Biodiversity: Mainstreaming the Economics of Nature: A Synthesis of the Approach, Conclusions and Recommendations of TEEB.

B. Experience with Achieving Target 20 / Adequacy or Further Action for Goal 1

Canada's experience: Canada helped to initiate the Financial Reporting Framework during CBD COP resource mobilization negotiations and has contributed submissions to each COP since that time. Canada submitted its most recent report for the CBD Financial Reporting Framework in October 2018, which covers 2006 to 2015. The key findings of the report are that: Canada mobilized an estimated average of \$CAN 9.46 billion annually from 2006-2015 to support biodiversity efforts internationally and domestically. Canada has provided an estimated average of \$CAN 90.47 million annually from 2006-



2015 in Official Development Assistance funds to support developing countries' efforts under the CBD. Canada also contributes to biodiversity in developing countries through our commitment to the GEF.

While the Framework is comprehensive, it is also complex and takes significant resources to complete properly. In Canada's experience, completing the Financial Reporting Framework is time-consuming, requiring significant dedicated human resources to complete and submit the framework every two years. Some sections require extensive research and information that is not readily available, even in a developed country like Canada where, within our federal system, domestic implementation for biodiversity is under several jurisdictions - provinces, territories, municipal governments and Indigenous communities. Non-governmental, private sector and academic activities and associated funding are also important. Collecting information from these different sources can be challenging, especially as there is no standard definition of biodiversity-related activities, nor standard format for biodiversity-related spending in budgets.

Further Action: While we support the Framework, we believe that improvements could make it less onerous on Parties and provide information that is more comparable. It is possible that one reason that a minority of Parties are reporting under the Framework is that reporting is complex and overly burdensome.

Further, we note that at COP-14, the Secretariat expressed the view that overall lack of capacity is an important constraint to implementing some of the targets, in particular targets 1(c) and 1(d). More than half of reporting Parties indicate that they do not have adequate financial resources to report funding needs, gaps, and priorities. In contrast, the UNDP BIOFIN programme appears to be having success in obtaining information under Goal 1. By COP-14, nine countries completed their assessment of funding needs and gaps. [RES MOB CBD/COP/14/6]

Therefore, in Canada's view, further action on Goal 1 could include:

- Refining the Financial Reporting Framework to making it more concise and streamlined, focusing on relevant essential information and promoting standardized reporting.
- Such a refinement could include a survey of CBD country focal points on their specific experiences with the Framework, consultations with the past expert panel on needs assessment, and researchers who have used the Framework (e.g., WWF-Germany).
- Assistance to some developing countries to build capacity for financial reporting; including encouraging participation in the UNDP BIOFIN programme.

References

- UNEP/CBD/COP/13/12/Add.2 Report of the Expert Team on a full assessment of the funds needed for the implementation of the convention and its protocols for the seventh replenishment of the Global Environment Facility
- UNEP/CBD/COP/14/6 on resource mobilization
- WWF, Germany (2018). Barometer on CBD's Strategy for Resource Mobilization.

GOAL 2: STRENGTHEN NATIONAL CAPACITY FOR RESOURCE UTILIZATION AND MOBILIZE DOMESTIC FINANCIAL RESOURCES FOR THE CONVENTION'S THREE OBJECTIVES

A. Evaluation of structure, content and effectiveness of Goal 2

Progress appears to be limited in this area, as the Secretariat reported to COP-14 that only 24 revised NBSAPs specifically contain a national resource mobilization strategy or equivalent. Complicating this



is that costing information is not always using the methodologies of BIOFIN or the financial reporting framework. [RES MOB CBD/COP/14/6]

Regarding the Targets under decision XII/3, as of COP-14:

Target 1 (b) - 74 Parties reported that they had made some progress to include biodiversity in national priorities or development plans.

Target 1 (d) - only four countries having undertaken comprehensive assessments, while 82% have undertaken at least some assessments.

In contrast, under UNDP BIOFIN, 30 countries are at the latest stage of preparing their finance plan.

B. Experience with Achieving Target 20 / Adequacy or Further Action

Canada's experience: Canada's domestic programs are aligned domestically with Goal 2. Canada's 6th National Report to the CBD provides examples of how Canada is integrating biodiversity in national priorities and development plans, including efforts to support species protection and recovery, address climate change and biodiversity, integrate biodiversity into agricultural and fisheries management, reduce pollution in aquatic ecosystems, and manage invasive alien species.

With respect to prioritizing official development assistance, in our experience, recipient countries are not identifying biodiversity as a priority for official development assistance, making it difficult to promote biodiversity as a focus for Canada's ODA contributions.

The Secretariat has indicated that there are persistent difficulties in countries in developing and reporting national finance plans. Two thirds of reporting Parties indicated not having adequate financial resources for preparing finance plans

Further Action: In Canada's view, further action on Goal 2 could include:

- Closer cooperation between development assistance agencies to encourage increased bilateral considerations in bilateral development assistance.
- Assistance to some developing countries to build capacity for financial reporting and planning; including encouraging participation in the UNDP BIOFIN programme.

References • UNEP/CBD/COP/14/6 on resource mobilization

GOAL 3: STRENGTHEN EXISTING FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS AND, PROMOTE REPLICATION AND SCALING-UP OF SUCCESSFUL FINANCIAL MECHANISMS AND INSTRUMENTS

A. Evaluation of structure, content and effectiveness of Goal 3

The international community has generally succeeded in achieving the Target 20 goal of increasing financial resources substantially from the current [2010] levels from all sources. In particular, total official development assistance (ODA) funding more than doubled. Donors to the Global Environment Facility (GEF) have consistently maintained funding levels for biodiversity over the period, although this would not be considered a substantial increase.

ODA funding: According to a 2018 WWF Report, official development assistance (ODA) funding is the most important flow to biodiversity funding. The report concluded that the overall funding commitment under Target 1(a) of the Resource mobilization strategy was fulfilled – i.e., doubling of the baseline figure by 2015. Using a baseline of average 2006-2010 of \$USD 3.4 billion, CBD donors collectively doubled their biodiversity-related funding and increased their expenditure to \$USD7.8



billion (increased by 130%) from the baseline to 2015. (Note - these figures do not include ODA contributions of the USA, a non-CBD-party.)

However, the WWF report also notes mixed results in terms of trends: donor contributions were uneven, some doubling, some increasing and some decreasing over the period. The report also noted that total ODA biodiversity funding decreased to \$USD 6.2 billion in 2016. [WWF]

The GEF has been very important to CBD resource mobilization. Biodiversity related GEF funding has increased about 30% between GEF-4 and GEF-7. GEF funding for biodiversity has been consistent over past 3 replenishments, at over \$1.2 billion over 4 years, around 30% of total GEF resources. Co-financing at ratios of 1 to 5 has lead to a total of \$9.705 billion being invested in GEF-6 towards the implementation of the Strategic Plan and achieving the Aichi Biodiversity from July 1, 2014 to June 30, 2018. [CBD/COP/14/7].

In addition to the biodiversity focal area, several other GEF focal areas contribute to Aichi targets: sustainable forest management, climate change, international waters, Impact programs, NGO pilot, LDC fund, small grants programme. [WWF] GEF investments in biodiversity projects deliver value for money. The GEF's Sixth Comprehensive Evaluation (OPS6), undertaken leading into GEF-7 in 2018, highlights the close alignment between the GEF's Biodiversity Focal Area Strategy and CBD guidance. The OPS6 concludes that: The GEF biodiversity focal area strategies have responded well to CBD guidance and direction; GEF support has enabled 189 of 196 (96 %) CBD parties to submit national reports to the CBD Secretariat; the outcome performance of the biodiversity portfolio is comparable to that of the GEF over-all, but sustainability remains a challenge (i.e., uptake/continuation of the work by countries after GEF project completion). Based on 554 terminal evaluations, 83 % of biodiversity projects had satisfactory outcome ratings (slightly higher than the GEF overall average of 81 %). [GEF OPS6 Final Report]

Private Sector Funding: There has been some success in mobilizing private sector funding, but the picture is not clear. At COP-14, the Secretariat reported that regarding measures taken to encourage the private sector as well as NGOs, foundations and academia to provide domestic support for implementing the Strategic Plan, 57 Parties indicated that some measures were taken and 12 countries reported that no measures were taken.

According to the Investing in Nature report, "there are no robust estimates of how much investment is going into natural capital at present, due to the lack of adequate metrics and robust methods to track these investments." Further, estimates of conservation financing vary widely, from \$52 billion per year, mainly from public and philanthropic sources, to \$8.2 billion private investments over the period 2004-2015. [Cooper, G. and Trémolet S. (2019)]

B. Experience with Achieving Target 20 / Adequacy or Further Action

Canada supports sustainable biodiversity conservation in developing countries primarily through contributions to the GEF, which operates as the financial mechanism of the CBD. Canada welcomes the findings of the GEF OPS6 report demonstrating that GEF's biodiversity funding is generally performing well. Canada believes that the GEF continues to serve CBD Parties well in assisting developing countries to meet their legally-binding obligations.

Canada supports bilateral initiatives in developing countries that: raise awareness about the drivers of biodiversity; reduce poverty and biodiversity loss through promoting sustainable livelihoods to ensure equitable access to, and sustainable management of, natural resources and the environment; and work with local partners to conserve and enhance biodiversity. Bilateral development assistance projects often focus on strengthening the capacities of local partners with regard to environmental governance, thereby resulting in an improvement in the status of biodiversity. Canada also provides support to non-governmental and multilateral organizations that play significant roles in reducing the loss of biodiversity and promoting its sustainable use.



Canada's private sector (business expenditures and user fees) averaged \$CAN 988 million between 2011/12 and 2015/16, rising to over \$CAN 1 billion by 2015/16. Canada's non-governmental organizations, foundations and academia averaged \$CAN 661 million between 2011/12 and 2015/16, rising to over \$CAN 820 million by 2015/16.

Further Action

- Adoption of an ambitious post-2020 global biodiversity framework would provide an important signal to donor and recipient countries of the need to strengthen and scale up investments in biodiversity funding.
- The next GEF replenishment period (2022-2026) offers an opportunity for donors to increase funding to the biodiversity focal areas, and to others with co-benefits for biodiversity, commensurate with an ambitious post-2020 global framework.
- An ambitious post-2020 framework will require significant private sector financing.

References	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • CBD/COP/14/7 - Review of Implementation of Article 21 (Financial Mechanism) – Report of the Council of the Global Environment Facility • GEF OPS6 Final Report - GEF Independent Evaluation Office. GEF in the Changing Environmental Financial Landscape. • WWF, Germany (2018). Barometer on CBD's Strategy for Resource Mobilization. • Cooper, G. and Trémolet S. (2019). Investing in Nature: Private Finance for Nature-based Resilience. The Nature Conservancy and Environmental Finance. London, UK.
------------	--

GOAL 4: EXPLORE NEW AND INNOVATIVE FINANCIAL MECHANISMS AT ALL LEVELS WITH A VIEW TO INCREASING FUNDING TO SUPPORT THE THREE OBJECTIVES OF THE CONVENTION

A. Evaluation of structure, content and effectiveness of Goal 4

Conventional sources of development assistance and environmental funding, GEF and other mechanisms, are providing important and significant levels of funding. However, the expert team projected that the GEF-7 funding needs would fall within the range between US\$ 2 billion and US\$ 4.5 billion. This is far beyond the current capacity of GEF-7, which has resources of \$US4.1 billion *over 4 years*, of which about \$US 1 billion is allocated to the biodiversity focal area.

Using a baseline of average 2006-2010 of \$USD 3.4 billion, CBD donors (i.e., not including the USA) collectively doubled their biodiversity-related funding and increased their expenditure to \$USD7.8 billion (an increase of 130%) from the baseline to 2015.

The first report of the High-Level Panel on Global Assessment of Resources for implementing the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020 presented a global assessment of the costs of meeting the Aichi Biodiversity Targets by 2020, estimating that, by adding the resource requirements for each Aichi Target, between US\$150 billion and US\$440 billion per year would be required.

All countries benefit from their domestic natural resources and have sovereign rights to utilize these resources. Likewise, and according to the CBD's Article 20, paragraph 1, the primary responsibility to conserve and protect natural resources is at the national level. Based on Article 20, paragraph 2, developed countries can assist developing countries. New and innovative sources and delivery mechanisms will be needed to make a quantum leap to achieve international funding levels required to address fully the challenges.

B. Experience with Achieving Target 20 / Adequacy or Further Action



Canada's experience (and data) related to innovative areas of private sector financing for biodiversity (such as biodiversity offsets, land conservation tax incentives, schemes for payment for ecosystem services (PES), and the sale of green products) is limited at present.

Further Action: Innovative financial mechanisms : The CBD has identified six "innovative financial mechanisms" The expert panel should take into account and explore options opportunities for introducing and/or scaling-up finance for biodiversity in all these areas, with estimates of revenue for each from OECD (2013):

- Environmental Fiscal Reform - Total revenue from environmentally related taxes in OECD countries in 2010 amounted to nearly \$USD 700 billion. However, revenues from taxes on pollution and resources (i.e. those most relevant for biodiversity) constitute a very small fraction of this total.
- Payments for Ecosystem Services (PES) - It is estimated that five national PES programmes alone channel more than \$USD 6 billion per year. Another study estimates that payments for watershed services in 2008 totalled over \$USD 9 billion.
- Biodiversity Offsets - In 2011, these programmes were estimated to have mobilised between \$USD 2.4 and \$USD 4 billion.
- Markets for Green Products.
- Biodiversity in Climate Change Funding - Climate change finance flows have been estimated at \$USD 70-120 billion annually in 2009-10, with lower bound estimates of biodiversity-related climate change finance from multilateral sources possibly amounting to USD 8 billion.
- Biodiversity in International Development Finance - Biodiversity-related bilateral Official Development Assistance (ODA), as tracked by the OECD Development Assistance Committee, increased from an average of \$USD 3.3 billion per year in 2005-06 to \$USD 5.7 billion per year in 2009-10.

There is sufficient literature on these mechanisms (see below for a couple of examples) and the expert panel process should seriously consider how these mechanisms could be effectively introduced, implemented and leveraged.

- A number of OECD reports look at the issue of biodiversity financing, including a 2013 report on Scaling-up Finance Mechanisms for Biodiversity that explores each of the above-mentioned areas from a number of angles – how they work, design and implementation, including social and environmental safeguards - and could serve as an important input for serious consideration.
- Likewise, the Little Biodiversity Finance Book outlines a number of innovative ideas for biodiversity financing.

Nature Based Solutions: There is increasing recognition of the importance and opportunities for nature-based solutions (NBS) (or natural climate solutions (NCS)) in addressing climate change, with significant co-benefits for biodiversity and ecosystems if properly implemented. NBS help to address climate change by using natural approaches, such as enhancing forest cover, restoring healthy wetlands and coastal zones, or conserving the diversity of soil microorganisms. NBS recognizes that biodiverse ecosystems are more climate-resilient than degraded ones and can deliver greater flows of ecosystem services, including the sequestration of carbon, helping to regulate climate, filter air and water, and reduce the impact of natural disasters. Conserving, sustainably managing and restoring ecosystems can provide a substantial and cost-effective contribution to meeting the Paris Agreement targets.

As noted above, between US\$150 billion and US\$440 billion per year would be required to achieve all the Aichi targets. There is no agreement on these figures. They are an indicative estimate, nor are there



any targets or realistic plans in place to raise such levels of funding. However, UNFCCC climate financing illustrates that where there is political will and multi-stakeholder involvement, ambitious targets can be set and significant steps taken. According to the OECD Director of Environment, climate financing reached \$USD 72 billion in 2017, towards the goal of \$100 billion by 2020.

Research shows that NBS could deliver up to one third of the greenhouse gas emissions reductions between now and 2030 needed to limit global warming to 2°C, many serving as cost-effective solutions relative to alternatives. NBS can protect ecosystems, contribute to climate resilience, restore land and transform agricultural, wetland and forestry practices. However, despite their massive potential, most estimates suggest NBS only attracts 2 to 3 % of public climate finance globally, and only a handful of regions and countries have policies in place that direct private sector finance to natural climate solutions at scale. [WBCSD]

By advocating for nature-based solutions within the other Rio Conventions, the UNFCCC and UNCCD, significant biodiversity-related goals could be achieved through “climate” financing, producing synergies for biodiversity, climate and efforts to counter desertification.

Lessons Learned from Other Relevant Processes

At the 7th Governing Body of the International Treaty on Plant Genetic Resources for Food and Agriculture in 2017 in Rwanda, the Governing Body (resolution 3/17) decided to revise the “Funding strategy and resource mobilization”. An ad hoc advisory Committee was created with regional representation. It would be worthwhile to explore the “Funding Strategy and Resource Mobilization” for relevance to the Post-2020 Framework.

Other Innovative Areas To Explore: A number of new and innovative techniques have been used in different countries and in different issues, in particular climate change, which have resulted in significant increases in resources. Unfortunately, much of the information we have is qualitative case studies, and it is difficult to gauge their wider applicability and opportunities for scaling-up. These serve as good examples but give the impression of being exceptions rather than the norm.

This expert panel process should explore the feasibility of a number of options with potential for implementation on a wide scale, suggested by the CBD Secretariat, and academic sources, such as:

- Blended finance;
- Green bonds;
- Philanthropy;
- International funds [Barbier];
- Global markets for environmental services [Barbier];
- Revenues from Global Trade and Finance [Barbier].

References	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Edward Barbier, 2012. The Challenge for Rio+20: Funding. Resources.• Edward B. Barbier, Joanne C. Burgess and Thomas J. Dean, 2018. How to pay for saving biodiversity. Science 360 (6388) pp. 486-488• OECD (2013), Scaling-up Finance Mechanisms for Biodiversity, OECD Publishing, Paris, https://dx.doi.org/10.1787/9789264193833-en.• Parker, C. et al. (2012), The Little Biodiversity Finance Book: A guide to proactive investment in natural capital (PINC), Global Canopy Programme.• World Business Council for Sustainable Development (WBCSD): “Natural climate solutions: the business perspective”
------------	---



GOAL 5: MAINSTREAM BIOLOGICAL DIVERSITY AND ITS ASSOCIATED ECOSYSTEM SERVICES IN DEVELOPMENT COOPERATION PLANS AND PRIORITIES INCLUDING THE LINKAGE BETWEEN CONVENTION'S WORK PROGRAMMES AND MILLENNIUM DEVELOPMENT GOALS

A. Evaluation	
NIL COMMENT	
B. Experience with Achieving Target 20 / Adequacy or Further Action	
NIL COMMENT	
References	

GOAL 6: BUILD CAPACITY FOR RESOURCE MOBILIZATION AND UTILIZATION AND PROMOTE SOUTH-SOUTH COOPERATION AS A COMPLEMENT TO NECESSARY NORTH-SOUTH COOPERATION

A. Evaluation	
NIL COMMENT	
B. Experience with Achieving Target 20 / Adequacy or Further Action	
NIL COMMENT	
References	

GOAL 7: ENHANCING IMPLEMENTATION OF ACCESS AND BENEFIT-SHARING INITIATIVES AND MECHANISMS IN SUPPORT OF RESOURCE MOBILIZATION

A. Evaluation	
NIL COMMENT	
B. Experience with Achieving Target 20 / Adequacy or Further Action	
NIL COMMENT	
References	

GOAL 8: ENHANCE THE GLOBAL ENGAGEMENT FOR RESOURCE MOBILIZATION IN SUPPORT OF THE ACHIEVEMENT OF THE CONVENTION'S THREE OBJECTIVES

A. Evaluation	
NIL COMMENT	
B. Experience with Achieving Target 20 / Adequacy or Further Action	
NIL COMMENT	
References	

(c) Please provide any relevant information that would support the estimation of the resources from all sources needed for different scenarios of the implementation of the post-2020 framework;



- CDB Financial Reporting Framework submissions and reports.
- CBD Needs assessment reports.
- Studies referenced above under Goal 1.

(d) Please provide your views on the possible structure and content of a draft resource mobilization component of the post-2020 biodiversity framework, as a follow-up to the current Strategy for Resource Mobilization;

A revised resource mobilization component of the Post-2020 Global Biodiversity Framework (GBF):

- Should include a specific target on resource mobilization, as it is essential for the adoption of the Post 2020 Framework.
- Could be open to consider merging the elements of current Aichi Target 3 on subsidies and incentives impacting biodiversity with the elements of current Aichi Target 20 for a single financing-related target, in an overall effort to streamline the total number of post-2020 targets to a practical level.
- Could consider a revised Target 20 that takes note of /underlines the scale of global financial needs (based on expert estimates).
- Should indicate the need for the GEF to continue to ensure that: (a) its biodiversity programming is well-aligned with the CBD's 2011-2020 Strategic Plan and the upcoming post-2020 global biodiversity; (b) that the amount of funding available under the GEF Biodiversity Focal Area for country allocations be maximized; and (c) that biodiversity co-benefits are fully captured when addressing climate change and land degradation through GEF's impact programs and use of nature-based solutions.
- Should particularly encourage new and innovative financing and investments from the private sector, international financial institutions and multilateral partners, learning from and linking with / building on climate change financing efforts.
- Should also encourage a call for more coordination between the Rio Conventions and other cross-issue projects, including joint climate change – biodiversity, chemicals and waste investments.

(e) Please provide your views and any relevant information concerning options and approaches for mobilizing and providing additional resources from all sources;

- SEE COMMENTS ON GOAL 4 ABOVE.

(f) Please provide your views and any relevant information on possible ways to strengthen the engagement of a wider range of financial and private institutions, at all levels and from all sources, to support the implementation of the post-2020 framework;

- SEE SUGGESTIONS PROVIDED IN RESPONSES ABOVE.

(g) Please provide your views and any relevant information on possible ways to further mainstream biodiversity into national economic budgets and development plans, including key productive sectors;

NIL



(h) Please provide your views and any relevant information on possible ways to improve the readiness and capacity of Parties to access and utilize financial resources in support of the implementation of the post-2020 framework.

- UNDP's Biodiversity Finance Initiative (BIOFIN) supports countries in reviewing policies and institutions relevant for biodiversity finance, determining baseline investments, assessing the costs of implementation and quantifying the biodiversity finance gap. BIOFIN appears to be serving the needs of developing countries and an increasing number of Parties are participating in the programme.

