**SUBMISSION BY THE GOVERNMENT OF SOUTH AFRICA IN RESPONSE TO NOTIFICATION SCBD/OES/CPP/JMF/87868**

**A. Structure of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework**

South Africa supports the maintaining of the current structure of the Strategic plan and the Aichi Targets. The Aichi Targets follow the same structure as the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) targets and indicators. The new agreement could maintain the approach while reworking the goals into desired biodiversity outcome statements that would be supported with the relevant indicators. The targets should follow the SMART approach with clear indicators for the purposes of accountability by Parties, other Governments and relevant organisations.

There are a number of complementary systems that can enhance the post 2020 global biodiversity framework. The System of Environmental-Economic Accounting (SEEA) is an integrated framework on the environment and economy, that has the potential to identify the impacts and drivers of biodiversity loss and enable an understanding of the trade-offs and interlinkages between biodiversity and the economy. In addition, the SEEA can act as an effective mainstreaming tool by bringing together and coordinating different stakeholders and communities, from environmental, statistical, economics and scientific communities

**B. Ambition of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework**

**Question: In the context of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework, what would “ambitious” specifically mean?**

The level of ambition of the new global targets should take into consideration the progress achieved under the current plan as a starting point and be adjusted in order to make the 2050 Vision feasible. The current strategic plan did not include the necessary resources for its full and effective implementation. In this regard, from our perspective “ambitious” would mean implementation targets specifically specified and commitments made against them.

**C. 2050 Vision for Biodiversity**

**Question: What, in real terms, does “living in harmony” with nature entail, what are the implications of this for the scope and content of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework and what actions are needed between now and 2050 to reach the 2050 Vision?**

“Living in harmony” with nature means that the biodiversity and ecosystems are conserved, sustainably utilized and benefits are equitably shared. The concept needs to include the developmental imperatives of society. As a result, the post 2020 global biodiversity framework needs to address the key limitations in the current strategic plan which include the insufficient attention paid to the enabling mechanisms identified by the plan as well as the mechanisms to address the third pillar of the Convention: the fair and equitable sharing arising out of the utilization of genetic resources.

Additional actions that address issues of sustainable use, equitable sharing of benefits and restoration and mainstreaming are required between now and 2050 to reach the 2050 Vision.

**D. Mission**

**Question: What would be the elements and content of an actionable 2030 mission statement for the post-2020 global biodiversity framework?**

The mission for the post-2020 should comprise elements that encourages conservation and sustainable use of biological diversity. It should also addresses pressures that leads to decline of biodiversity and sectors driving declines (e.g. agriculture, mining and infrastructure development).

**E. Biodiversity Targets**

(**a) What does “SMART” targets mean in practical terms?**

The incorporation of science- and knowledge-based “SMART” biodiversity targets and indicators is crucial for a successful post-2020 biodiversity framework.

The new targets need to be pragmatic and easily measured in order galvanize progress and facilitate implementation. The targets need to include elements that address the needs of parties without inadvertently creating administrative burdens on developing countries.

**(b) How should the set of targets in the post-2020 global biodiversity framework relate to existing Aichi Biodiversity Targets?**

They should continue to reflect (i) Pressure-State-Response variables; (ii) if a Response variable, whether they relate to inputs, processes, outputs, outcomes or impacts; and (iii) the target is quantitatively specific. For example ambitious, specific, quantified targets to reduce deforestation and wetland degradation, increase the sustainability of fisheries, minimize agricultural expansion, tackle invasive alien species, increase the scale and effectiveness of protected areas (and their coverage of important sites for biodiversity and large areas of intact habitat such as primary forest), address ocean acidification, recover threatened species, and augment financing. This set of headline targets could be sufficiently focused as to concentrate efforts while being adequately broad in impact as to advance biodiversity conservation substantially. They could be underpinned by more specific subsidiary targets covering the other aspects and elements of the Aichi Targets.

The set of targets should build up on the current process. However certain target would require a fresh look in order to contribute to the mission. That will include the integration to target or targets that are linked to the implementation of the Cartagena protocol and the new and emerging issues under the Convention.

**(c) How should the set of targets in the post-2020 global biodiversity framework align with other global targets, including those adopted under the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development?**

The key element is to ensure the alignment of the post-2020 biodiversity framework and targets with the 2030 Agenda. Alignment of the two initiatives will help harness synergies and reduce the burden placed on countries.

They should encourage collaboration between relevant organisations**.** There is need to strengthen mainstreaming of biodiversity through relevant international processes to guide the implementation of the post 2020 frame work in order to build up to the 2050 vision.

**F. Voluntary commitments and contributions**

**Question: What form should voluntary commitments for biodiversity take and how should these relate to or be reflected in the post-2020 global biodiversity framework?**

The voluntary commitments and contributions should encourage Parties to undertake for an example of inventory of the indicators being used at national level in order to monitor progress towards each Targets. This means that Parties will be able to report on what they can be able to achieve within their own span of control and given resources.

**G. Relationship between the post-2020 global biodiversity framework and other relevant processes**

**Question: How could a post-2020 global biodiversity framework help to ensure coherence, integration and a holistic approach to biodiversity governance and what are the implications for the scope and content of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework?**

The 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development provides a framework for establishing the biodiversity-related SDGs and targets as central to national development processes. SDGs 2.5, 14 and 15 are the most directly related to biodiversity, and concern the conservation and sustainable use of aquatic and terrestrial environments and species, respectively. For this purpose, establishing synergies with targets under other Conventions should be fostered to avoid the duplication of efforts.

Synergies among biodiversity conservation actions, ecosystem restoration approaches and the maintenance of ecological processes can be encouraged.

The biodiversity-related SDG targets which expire in 2020 will be extended and refined, it is appropriate to focus on catalysing actions and resources for their achievement.

**H. Mainstreaming**

**Question: How can the post-2020 global biodiversity framework incorporate or support the mainstreaming of biodiversity across society and economies at large?**

The drivers of biodiversity decline, namely habitat loss, overexploitation, illegal trade, invasive species, pathogens spill over, pollution and climate change are currently the main threats to biodiversity conservation.

Above all, it should ensure the mainstreaming biodiversity in productive sectors, by facilitating the necessary economic and behavioral changes, taking into account national circumstances and priorities

1. **Relationship with the current Strategic Plan**

**Question: What are the lessons learned from the implementation of the current Strategic Plan? And how can the transition from the current decade to the post-2020 framework avoid further delays in implementation and where should additional attention be focused?**

The Strategic Plan for Biodiversity for the post-2020 period needs to build on the current plan while making a concerted effort to ensure that new global targets are incorporated that address in an equitable manner all three objectives of the Convention, which are intertwined and mutually supportive.

Innovative ways to integrate biodiversity in the economic sectors are urgently required to ensure that biodiversity loss is halted. These approaches need to include increasing sustainable agricultural practices, protecting landscapes and seascapes, restoring degraded lands, enhancing ecosystem based adaptation, natural capital accounting, overexploitation and controlling pollution. The establishment of an effective mechanism to ensure the sharing of benefits arising out of the utilization of genetic resources, including those arising from digital sequence information on genetic resources, with countries of origin can also play a role. Such approaches can be used to increase investments in conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity.

**J. Indicators**

**Question: What indicators, in addition to those already identified in decision XIII/28, are needed to monitor progress in the implementation of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework at the national, regional and global scales?**

The new Strategic Plan should thus have more precise targets addressing the three objectives of the Convention and covering the main issues related to biodiversity.

It is very important that the post-2020 biodiversity framework be realistic to implement. To support implementation, a standardized set of scalable global biodiversity indicators based on clear definitions and agreed concepts would be beneficial to aid countries in identifying actionable and measurable responses.

**K. Implementation and NBSAPs**

**Question: How can the effectiveness and implementation of the NBSAPs be strengthened, what additional mechanisms or tools, if any, are required to support implementation of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework and how should these be reflected in the framework?**

The NBSAP are the main vehicles of national implementation of the Convention on Biological Diversity. Other NBSAP already provide opportunities for mainstreaming, integration of other relevant stakeholders while demonstrating how biodiversity and ecosystem services should be conserved, used sustainably, and the benefits of this use shared equitably.

South Africa views the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020, and its Aichi Biodiversity targets as important documents that outline global commitment to halting the loss of biodiversity. This Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020 included important elements that provided clear vision and ambitious goals and targets. The Strategic plan provided comprehensive guidance to countries and was important for informing the second generation NBSAPs of parties.

**L. Resource mobilization**

**Question: How should the post-2020 global biodiversity framework address resource mobilization and what implications does this have for the scope and content of the framework?**

This is an important parameter that will require a concerted effort in the post 2020 framework. In this regard, it is important to develop specific targets that will ensure predictable resources are available for advancing the ambitious work programme that will be adopted. Some of the elements that can be considered could include:

* It is recommended that a standing committee on resource mobilization be established to oversee the development of a comprehensive resource mobilization strategy
* The setting of specific targets of resources for the elements of the strategic plan
* An emphasis on unlocking the resources that could be made available through the sustainable use of biodiversity and the equitable sharing of benefits
* Consideration of the possibility of developing a new biodiversity fund like LDN or GCF funds that will complement GEF and incorporate resources from innovative financing mechanisms that include private sector contributions

**M. Financial mechanisms**

**Question: How can the Global Environment Facility support the timely provision of financial resources to assist eligible Parties in implementing the post-2020 global biodiversity framework?**

The financial mechanism for the convention needs to be amended to become more accessible. The current mechanism has become onerous for eligible parties to access and the extensive co financing requirements mean that GEF resources are difficult to access.

The link between the guidance from the convention and the GEF programming framework needs to be enhanced so that the GEF responds fully to all three objectives of the convention in an equal and balanced manner.

**N. Review process**

**Question: What additional mechanisms, if any, are required to support the review of implementation of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework and how should these be integrated into the framework?**

The Post-2020 Plan should also have an agreed review mechanism to assess the matching of the level of ambition and implementation of the revised NBSAPs and their revised national targets with the global targets, as well as a more effective monitoring and modelling framework to assess progress (or lack of progress) and its consequences.

**O. Relationship between the Convention and the Protocols**

Post2020 framework should consider the three objectives of CBD in a balanced manner with equal emphasis on all three objectives

The 2 (+ 1) Protocols are separate legal instruments that support the objectives of the Convention

Standalone strategic plans are required for the protocols with specific cross cutting indicators that are linked to the post2020 strategic plan

The protocols provide important contributions to the sustainable use and equitable sharing of benefits objectives of the convention and specific elements may be incorporated to balance the framework

The operational nature of the Protocols mean that they provide important elements that complement the SDGs and contribute to their achievement (food security, health)

The plan would need to sufficiently integrate the work of the two protocols as this will provide the convention with a more direct link with the SDG agenda.

Recalling that the Convention on Biological Diversity requires under Article 8 (g) requires Parties to “Establish or maintain means to regulate, manage or control the risks associated with the use and release of living modified organisms resulting from biotechnology which are likely to have adverse environmental impacts that could affect the conservation and sustainable use of biological diversity, taking also into account the risks to human health” it is important to ensure that Protocol aspects are incorporated into the Post 2020 global biodiversity framework.

In addition, the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety plays an important role in providing global risk assessment and risk management frameworks for emerging technologies. It is therefore recommended that specific elements on integrating the work of the Convention and its protocols on responding to emerging technologies be incorporated. There have been many developments in the science of modern biotechnology since the entry into force of the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety. In this regard, it may be prudent to consider undertaking a specific review aimed at considering the appropriateness of the scope of the current legal instrument to respond to developments in the technology.

**Question: What are the issues associated with access and benefit-sharing under the Convention and what are the implications for the post-2020 global biodiversity framework?**

**P. Integrating diverse perspectives**

Biological diversity underpins ecosystem functioning and the provision of ecosystem services that are essential for human well-being. It provides for food security, human health, the provision of clean air and water; it contributes to local livelihoods, and economic development more generally. Noting the vision of the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020, adopted by the Conference of the Parties in 2010, is: "Living in Harmony with Nature" where "By 2050, IPLC becomes integral part to ensure that the biodiversity is valued, conserved, restored and wisely used, maintaining ecosystem services, sustaining a healthy planet and delivering benefits essential for all people."

The principle aspect to be honoured would be one thatcreates conditions that allow all parties and stakeholders, including representatives from Indigenous peoples and women’s groups, have a balanced opportunity to provide input in the process.

**Question: How can the post-2020 global biodiversity framework facilitate the involvement of indigenous peoples and local communities and support the integration of traditional knowledge as a cross-cutting issue?**

**Question: How should gender issues be reflected in the scope and content of the post2020 global biodiversity framework?**

The Rio Conventions have consistently reaffirmed a commitment to gender equality and women’s empowerment as necessary prerequisites to meet global development goals and to combat climate change, land degradation and biodiversity loss. Reaffirming and strengthening these commitments in ongoing actions, as well as anchoring gender responsive, coherent strategies and actions in post-2020 frameworks, is imperative for successfully progressing on toward meeting the SDGs and long-term biodiversity conservation.

**Question: How should issues related to subnational governments, cities and other local authorities be reflected in the scope and content of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework?**

Currently urban areas constitute only around 2 percent of the Earth’s land surface area, they are home to over half of the world’s population and are responsible for roughly 75 percent of global resource consumption. And urbanization is only on the rise; by 2050, an estimated [68 percent](https://www.un.org/development/desa/publications/2018-revision-of-world-urbanization-prospects.html) of the global population will live in cities. Given the foregoing, local and other subnational governments have a critical role to play in driving the global biodiversity agenda at a national level by partnering on the implementation of the strategic plan. Therefore, there should be targets and specific indicators to ensure monitoring.

**Question: How can the post2020 global biodiversity framework facilitate the involvement of civil society in the development and implementation of the framework?**

**Question: How can the post-2020 global biodiversity framework facilitate the involvement of youth in the development and implementation of the framework?**

**Question: How should issues related to the engagement of the private sector be reflected in the scope and content of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework?**

**Question: How should the post-2020 global biodiversity framework reflect diverse and multiple perspectives?**

**Q. Communication and outreach**

**Question: How should the post-2020 global biodiversity framework address issues related to communication and awareness and how can the next two years be used to enhance and support the communication strategy adopted at the thirteenth meeting of the Conference of the Parties to the Convention on Biological Diversity to ensure an appropriate level of awareness?**

**SOUTH AFRICA’S COMMENTS OF THE OVERVIEW OF THE POST-2020 PROCESS FOR THE CARTAGENA PROTOCOL ON BIOSAFETY**

**(1) The structure and content of the Implementation Plan for the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety post-2020**

The structure and content of the implementation plan for the Cartagena Protocol post 2020 should be developed in a manner that complements the global framework. In compiling this new framework it will be importance to learn from the successes and failures of the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020. There are several elements of that plan that remain applicable and important to the Parties’ implementation efforts.

This process can be informed through a stock-taking of the 2011-2020 Strategic Plan for the Protocol as well as analysis of the 4th country reports.

South Africa is of the view that while significant achievements have been made towards the implementation of the Protocol; more effort is required for the activities that support the actual implementation of the Protocol. Many developing countries in the African region have developed national biosafety frameworks but now require support to undertake the actual implementation.

In this regard, Parties would be best served by retaining a focus on the elements of the 2011-2020 plan that remain relevant and are yet to be fully realized.

The focus in the Implementation Plan for the post-2020 framework should be on the operational aspects such as:

* risk assessment and risk management
* identification, detection and packaging
* Liability and redress
* Socio economic considerations
* Synthetic biology
* Public awareness and participation

Specific, measurable, attainable, realistic and time bound (SMART) targets that respond to these elements in a comprehensive manner are required.

In addition, this framework needs to be extensive enough to include elements for implementation by a broad range of stakeholders.

**(2) Possible elements of a specific action plan for capacity-building on biosafety, covering the Cartagena Protocol and its Supplementary Protocol**

There is need to align the capacity building plan with the Implementation Plan for the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety post-2020. The action plan must be complementary to the long-term strategic framework for capacity-building beyond 2020 under the Convention.

**(3) Relevant elements of the biosafety component of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework.**

The Post 2020 global biodiversity framework needs to ensure a balanced approach to the three objectives of the convention, biodiversity conservation, and sustainable use and benefit sharing. The Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety responds to the sustainable utilization of biodiversity and in this regard could be incorporated into the framework under this broad objective.

Recalling that the Convention on Biological Diversity requires under Article 8 (g) requires Parties to “Establish or maintain means to regulate, manage or control the risks associated with the use and release of living modified organisms resulting from biotechnology which are likely to have adverse environmental impacts that could affect the conservation and sustainable use of biological diversity, taking also into account the risks to human health” it is important to ensure that Protocol aspects are incorporated into the Post 2020 global biodiversity framework.

In addition, the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety plays an important role in providing global risk assessment and risk management frameworks for emerging technologies. It is therefore recommended that specific elements on integrating the work of the Convention and its protocols on responding to emerging technologies be incorporated. There have been many developments in the science of modern biotechnology since the entry into force of the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety. In this regard, it may be prudent to consider undertaking a specific review aimed at considering the appropriateness of the scope of the current legal instrument to respond to developments in the technology.

The Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety responds to the vision of the current Strategic Plan of a world of “Living in harmony with nature” where “By 2050, biodiversity is valued, conserved, restored and wisely used, maintaining ecosystem services, sustaining a healthy planet and delivering benefits essential for all people”. In particular, the activities undertaken through the risk assessment and risk management provisions ensure that biodiversity is valued, conserved and ecosystem services are maintained.

Possible targets to be developed should be SMART and provide outcome oriented results that ensure conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity. An example of such a target could be” By 2030, measures to safeguard biodiversity from the adverse effects that may arise from living modified organisms developed through modern biotechnology are in place”