

**Submission by the EU and its Member States to CBD Notification 2019/075:  
Invitation to provide proposals on the post-2020 global biodiversity framework****1. Introduction**

The EU and its Member States have submitted their views in response to CBD Notification 2019-008 (submission of 14 May 2019), Notification 2018-063 (submission of 20 December 2018) and Notification 2018-063 (submission of 27 August 2018). Further views have been expressed in the statements and positions made at the first Open Ended Working Group in Nairobi, 27-30 August 2019. The present submission seeks to complement and clarify these views on a limited number of issues without repetition of earlier views.

EU and its Member States would like to thank the co-chairs and the Secretariat for their tireless work and appreciate the very constructive work and interventions made by the Parties and observers during OEWG-1 including the summary contained in the Non-paper on possible elements for the post-2020 biodiversity framework for further discussion (30 August).

We welcome the broad understanding of the OEWG-1 of the need for transformational change, the urgency of addressing the drivers of biodiversity loss identified in the IPBES Global Assessment through SMART targets and enhanced implementation. These are indeed indispensable for achieving each of the three objectives of the Convention. Furthermore, without biodiversity, the achievement of 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development is not possible. The post-2020 framework should be clear on this issue.

We welcome the OEWG-1 readiness and options for a clear logic that links the various elements in the post-2020 global biodiversity framework. Ultimately, the new framework should address four simple questions: 1) where do we want to be in 2050, 2) what actions are needed to get on the right path in next 10 years, 3) what are the requisite enabling conditions and 4) how do we ensure effective implementation.

OEWG1 invited SBSTTA to provide elements on specific goals and SMART targets, indicators, baselines and monitoring frameworks, within the scope of the three objectives of the Convention. For a solid preparation of the framework and making best use of the time prior to OEWG2, we think it is very important that SBSTTA-23 provides scientific and technical advice and makes recommendations on the above mentioned elements and also discusses:

- Options for one or a small number of potential overarching objective(s), including its or their relation to the 2030 Mission,
- 2050 Vision needs to be unpacked to allow scenarios and models to be applied and indicators used to assess progress,
- Action-oriented targets to address the drivers of biodiversity loss so as to achieve transformative change as identified by IPBES, in particular where they are not explicitly covered by scheduled consultation meetings or other processes.

**2. Timescales for targets, goals, 2030 Mission, 2050 Vision and possible overarching objective(s)**

EU and its MS propose that in the structure and on the vision and mission, the following considerations should be included:

- The Mission 2030 should be inspirational, motivating, actionable and easy to communicate.

- The Mission could include, if feasible, one or a small number of overarching objective(s), acting as a clear and measurable milestone on the path to the 2050 Vision. Such an overarching objective should motivate action on biodiversity across the UN system and by all stakeholders. It is important that SBSTTA23 discusses options for this, including options focusing on long-term biodiversity outcomes as well as action-oriented options (we are aware of on-going discussions e.g. on no human-induced extinctions and area protected and sustainably managed).
- Different types of goals, targets and sub-targets need to be determined: (a) long-term outcome oriented (providing milestones towards 2050); (b) short-term action oriented (before 2030); (c) ongoing enabling conditions. These categories are equally important, with no hierarchy between them. Sub-targets could be designed for biomes, e.g. as referred to in the IPBES regional and global assessments. Specific action plans, or other dedicated tools to complement NBSAPs, should be considered or the implementation at this level.
- In addition, the goals, targets and further milestones should offer a clear link and pathway to the 2050 Vision, including references to the state of biodiversity as well as to the actions taken to address pressures and main drivers of biodiversity loss.
- As regards the existing 2050 Vision, taking into account where feasible the COP 14/2 decision, scenarios and models (for instance back-casting) and SMART targets needs to be developed and applied in order to measure progress towards the 2050 Vision (unpacking) and the milestones.
- Additionally, unpacking the 2050 Vision should help to show how it reflects and is consistent with the three objectives of the Convention, including an understanding of how 'bending the curve' of biodiversity loss across the various dimensions (such as species, abundance, ecosystem condition, ecosystem services) relates to those objectives.

The EU and its Member States underline the strong interlinkages between coherent measures, actions and the protocols for achieving the CBD three objectives. Moreover, synergies with the other Rio Conventions, SDGs, the biodiversity-related MEAs and with the Paris Agreement for climate change, as well as with the relevant programmes implemented by other international bodies, UNEP, UNDP, FAO, IMO, International Seabed Authority, UNESCO, GEF and others including co-benefits, are essential.

### **3. Scope, rationale and structure**

We understand, based on the IPBES Global Assessment (2019), that the 2050 Vision can only be achieved by addressing the drivers of biodiversity loss, including through transformative changes in society and economies. The scope for the post-2020 global biodiversity framework should address this challenge, identifying where complementary actions may be required in other sectors and processes. A narrow focus on a selective set of issues will not allow for achieving the 2050 Vision.

In order to contribute to the achievement of the 2050 Vision for biodiversity, we should include the following structural elements: (EU submission 20.12.2018 and EU submission 14.05.2019)

- 2030 Mission
- Goals and Targets
- Milestones
- Indicators
- Implementation instruments, including for NBSAPs

- Measurement, reporting and verification system, including review and a possible ratcheting up mechanism.

A logical link between the 2050 Vision, the 2030 Mission and different groups of goals and targets are important:

The Mission 2030 should be inspirational, motivating and easy to communicate, providing a clear and measurable milestone to demonstrate progress towards the 2050 Vision.

In addition, milestones should offer a clear link and pathway to the 2050 Vision, including references to the state of biodiversity as well as to the actions taken to address pressures and main drivers of biodiversity loss.

Targets should be designed and presented in a way that makes them understandable to different stakeholders and allows a clearer messaging and focus. For instance, a clearer focus could be on actions that address the direct and indirect drivers of biodiversity loss, distinguishing more clearly from goals and targets related to the state of biodiversity and those related to enabling conditions. Targets could also be translated into sub-targets for biomes, as relevant.

In the context of the whole set of targets, areas which are not covered by the current framework for instance, on the links between biodiversity and climate change, health, cities and urban biodiversity, biotechnologies, plastics, marine litter, pollinators and soil should be taken into account.

As suggested by the co-chairs, the actions to tackle the drivers of biodiversity loss needs to be scaled-up at all levels (global, national and local levels).

The post-2020 framework, has to be applicable to all UN bodies, biodiversity related conventions and stakeholders. It should strengthen the implementation of the CBD and its Protocols, as well as of the other Rio Conventions, the Paris Agreement and other biodiversity-related MEAs, and contribute to the relevant SDGs.

Nature-based solutions<sup>1</sup> should be highlighted as an essential element to address in an integrated way biodiversity loss and global challenges, such as climate change, disaster risk reduction and poverty reduction.

All the references to Protected Areas and OECMs have to be closely linked with increasing the effectiveness of management of the areas, as well as representativeness and connectivity.

The role of transformative change, in particular to address the indirect drivers for biodiversity loss, as highlighted in the IPBES Global Assessment, should feature as an overarching element to reach the 2050 Vision for biodiversity, the goals, and be translated into the relevant targets.

The EU and its Member States reiterate our full support for the COP14/24 decision that provides for developing the long-term strategic plan for capacity building, recognizing the importance of capacity building (and the related financial, human and knowledge resources) for implementation of the post-2020 framework. We will be happy to contribute to the discussion including at the global consultation workshop in Kunming after OEWG2.

---

<sup>1</sup> Nature-based Solutions (NbS) defined by IUCN: "Actions to protect, sustainably manage, and restore natural or modified ecosystems, that address societal challenges effectively and adaptively, simultaneously providing human well-being and biodiversity benefits".

The EU and its Member States stress the importance of addressing resource mobilization as an integral part of a post-2020 global biodiversity framework as decided at COP14/22. The mobilization of all types of resources (financial, human, technical and institutional) from all sources, including from domestic resources and from the private sector, needs to be increased to support an ambitious Post-2020 Framework and their allocation should be optimized in order to close the current and future gaps of biodiversity finance. Increases in dedicated funding for biodiversity action are needed but will not be sufficient. The principles set out by the Addis Ababa Action Agenda for development financing should guide the discussions.

Resource mobilisation should therefore cover the different aspects, in particular, 1) reducing the need for resources (e.g. through mainstreaming), 2) enhanced efficiency and cost-effectiveness (e.g. through capacity building and synergies) and 3) generation of new resources from all sources.

Furthermore, an increased role of blending could be explored, combining public and private funds, and different types of financial instruments, such as grants, loans, equity, guarantees and supported by technical assistance and capacity building for instance.

Also domestic resource mobilization needs to be improved, by creating an enabling environment: establishing an appropriate legal framework setting the rules for all stakeholders (also establishing their rights and assets) and creating incentives, i.a. through tax reform. This should be accompanied by adequate capacity building, and awareness raising and underpinned by enhanced biodiversity mainstreaming in sector policies and the integration of resource mobilization in the NBSAPs. We will be happy to contribute to the discussions on this topic, including at the thematic consultation workshop in Berlin before OEWG2.

As regards the Protocols of the Convention, we are open to explore different options on how to include biosafety and access and benefit sharing (ABS) with regard to the utilisation of genetic resources into the new framework, both as a specific biosafety and ABS component but also under relevant targets. See submission May 2019.

Besides the earlier EU and its Member States suggestions on how to include biosafety and ABS in the framework, we believe that several ideas that were generated, during the two consultations that took place on 25 August 2019 merit further consideration. We think that these should be included in the preparations for OEWG2.

#### **4. NBSAPs, voluntary commitments and CBD Work programmes**

EU and its Member States want to underline the urgent need by all CBD Parties to update their NBSAPs. The global framework should provide for all Parties and stakeholders to report on actions/commitments by the end of 2021. Moreover, updated NBSAPs should allow comparability and assessment of progress against the global framework at regional and global level. Updated NBSAPs should address all targets of the Global Biodiversity Framework and the three objectives of the CBD in the global framework.

The post-2020 framework should strengthen existing and provide new instruments for effective implementation (implementation mechanism/review mechanism), and include more specific requirements or guidance for NBSAPs and commitments (if commitments not included in NBSAPs). The NBSAP should be directly connected with the other national strategies (economic development, energy, forestry, fisheries etc.). The NBSAPs should be endorsed by the whole Government, including by the Head of State or Government.

Our views on commitments expressed in the submission pursuant to notification 2019/008, question F, continue to apply.<sup>2</sup> Voluntary commitments can spur political momentum and provide Parties with an opportunity to take leadership on specific targets or issues. The post-2020 global biodiversity framework could establish the modalities for ensuring a strong contribution from such voluntary commitments, including for review of implementation, assessment whether they support the achievement of the global targets. This should be coherent with the update of NBSAPs and the monitoring and review mechanisms for overall implementation of the new framework as referred to above. This may include a possible mechanism for ratcheting-up implementation. Voluntary commitments need to be additional to commitments included in existing NBSAPs, and may subsequently be included within NBSAPs as and when they are updated. In this way, it will be possible for Parties to increase ambition without depending on the update cycle of NBSAPs.

This approach differs from the approach under the Paris Agreement and its Nationally Determined Contributions. For biodiversity, commitments can precede NBSAPs pending their inclusion in the relevant NBSAP at its next revision. For this reason, in the CBD context we propose to refer to 'biodiversity commitments on a voluntary basis'.

Non-state actors can play a significant role in strengthening the implementation of a post-2020 global biodiversity framework. It is important to encourage voluntary commitments from all relevant actors and stakeholders, including indigenous peoples and local communities as well as the private sector, starting prior to the COP 15 and onward, to contribute to an effective post-2020 global biodiversity framework and to make such information available as a contribution to the Sharm El-Sheikh to Kunming Action Agenda as agreed in COP Decision 14/34, paragraph 12.

The post-2020 global biodiversity framework should help to clarify the role and operation of existing and possibly new work programmes under the Convention, which should be updated accordingly.

## 5. Mainstreaming

Effective mainstreaming of biodiversity into and across sectors is pivotal for implementing the Convention and the global biodiversity framework, for achieving the SDGs and for contributing to the implementation of the Paris Agreement, the Sendai framework and other relevant global frameworks as stated in COP Decision 14/3.

---

<sup>2</sup> The relevant part is the following:

"The EU and its Member States consider it essential to include in the post-2020 framework a process to ensure timely implementation and fostering political and stakeholder engagement. For strengthening NBSAPs, this could include a process or mechanism for Parties for biodiversity commitments, individually or jointly. This process should also facilitate and encourage voluntary commitments by non-State actors.

As indicated in the EU and its Member States reply of 20 December 2018 to notification 2018-063 (p.4), the post-2020 framework should "establish the modalities for ensuring a strong contribution from such commitments, including for review of implementation, assessment whether they allow achieving the global targets and ratcheting up if needed. This should be coherent with the monitoring and review mechanisms for overall implementation of the new framework as referred to above."

Commitments can take many forms, but modalities should address:

- the timing;
- information to be included in the description, including as regards their relation with the relevant targets, the envisaged means for implementation and the way in which they relate/complement/exceed the relevant NBSAP;
- reporting, review and potential ratcheting up, see the reply to question N below.

For effectiveness and efficiency, commitments should be encouraged in particular with respect to the main drivers of biodiversity loss and the effort should be commensurate to the relevant challenge/target.

Commitments should respect the principle of non-regression, taking into account the various dimensions of SMART formulation"

NBSAPs are key instruments for implementing the Convention and are also important, alongside other sectoral strategies, for mainstreaming of biodiversity into and across all relevant sectors. Therefore mainstreaming should not be summarised under cross-cutting issues, but also be considered under implementation instruments.

Legal instruments, integrated environment and development strategies, and good governance, including mechanisms to enhance policy coherence for sustainable development, for the integration of biodiversity considerations in all relevant sectors have an important role to halt biodiversity loss and maintain the delivery of ecosystem services. Phasing out incentives harmful to biodiversity and developing positive incentives for the conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity in all relevant sectoral policies, is a key objective for mainstreaming of biodiversity.

Responsible and sustainable sourcing and use of raw materials and commodities reconciled with the protection of ecosystems and biodiversity in source and user countries and the need for responsible and sustainable governance of the relevant sectors in support of the transition towards a circular economy are essential elements.

Nature-based solutions, agro-ecology, soil restoration, green infrastructure, urban biodiversity, natural capital accounting and other innovations, can play an important role in operationalizing mainstreaming of biodiversity, while achieving other environmental objectives also supporting the implementation of the Paris Agreement.

We support the development of a global action plan to mainstream biodiversity and health into relevant policies, strategies, programmes and accounts of the CBD Parties, in cooperation with relevant organizations, such as WHO and other stakeholders (CBD/COP14/4 para 13).

We support the establishment of a long-term strategic approach on mainstreaming under the CBD as described in annex I of the COP Decision 14/3 as well as a component for mainstreaming biodiversity in a post-2020 global biodiversity framework as one of its key elements. We want to stress the importance of ensuring a close coordination and integration between both these processes.

We welcome the FAO engagement for mainstreaming biodiversity, including the platform on this issue.

For an effective post-2020 framework, it is indispensable to address mainstreaming of biodiversity across all key sectors: agriculture, forestry, fisheries, aquaculture, tourism, energy, mining, infrastructure, transport, manufacturing and processing sectors and others that may still be identified. This could be addressed, through setting specific and measurable targets for each sector in order to facilitate significant achievements. Furthermore, internalization of the environmental costs in market processes is a key element for mainstreaming biodiversity.

Mainstreaming is a cross-cutting issue that could require its own target and sub-target in the post-2020 framework in addition to targets more specifically addressing the sectors and biomes concerned. The CBD sustainable use objective needs more attention. This is without prejudice to the need to address the genetic diversity of cultivated plants and farmed and domesticated animals and of wild relatives. For all sectors, stakeholders concerned should be closely involved.

The post-2020 framework should highlight the importance of ecosystem services for human well-being in all aspects (climate change mitigation and adaptation including through nature-based solutions, poverty eradication, food safety, human well-being and health, energy, etc.).

Additionally, the post-2020 framework should include mainstreaming biodiversity across climate change mitigation and adaptation measures and actions, to ensure these are coherent, synergetic and respectful with all biodiversity goals and targets.

The framework should encourage the use and further development of methodologies, metrics and tools for assessing the intrinsic and economic value of nature and promote collaboration between public and private actors in this regard. The adoption at national level of environmental accounting systems within the System of environmental – economic accounting Experimental Ecosystem Accounting (SEEA EEA) and System of environmental – economic Central Framework (SEEA CF) should be strengthened.

Coherence and close connection with the SDGs and other frameworks is very important, especially when addressing mainstreaming (across sectors and policies), but it should not exclude adjustment of the formulation or raising the level of ambition, where needed. It is important to emphasize the benefits and essential contribution of the biodiversity targets to achieve the SDGs and the Paris Agreement and vice versa. A clear relationship is important to facilitate the understanding both by policy makers and wider public.

Mainstreaming of biodiversity should be included both as a horizontal approach and as an implementation dimension, as well as through possible specific and measurable targets for several key sectors and policies, including addressing unsustainable consumption and production patterns. It should give greater opportunities for the private sector to play an active role. Voluntary certification schemes can be of value for this purpose.

The long-term strategic approach for mainstreaming biodiversity needs to be a core element of the post-2020 framework, to ensure enabling actions and conditions with engagement of all relevant sectors including the private sector, land owners and users. The SDGs provide an enabling framework for mainstreaming.

---