



Institute for Biodiversity – Network

## **CBD Post-2020 Global Biodiversity Framework: Stocktaking between OEWG-1 and SBSTTA-23 22./23.10.2019, Bonn, Germany**

The process for the development of the CBD post-2020 global biodiversity framework is ongoing and a first meeting of the respective Open Ended Working Group (OEWG 1) had recently taken place (August 2019 in Nairobi). The Subsidiary Body for Scientific, Technical and Technological Advice (SBSTTA) at its 23rd meeting in November 2019 will also deal with some aspects for the preparation of the new framework.

At this moment in the process between OEWG 1 and SBSTTA 23 the **Institute for Biodiversity Network (ibn) on behalf of the German Federal Agency for Nature Conservation (BfN)** was hosting a **two days workshop with stakeholders and experts from science, NGOs and civil society at the European level.**

The aims of the workshop were to discuss:

- the status of the process  
the outcomes of OEWG 1 with respect to content and further activities
- the science base for the framework (IPBES Global Assessment and GBO 5 draft key messages)
- possible implementation mechanisms
- elements for the framework based on the OEWG 1 outcome paper and the documents prepared for SBSTTA 23 related to the global biodiversity framework
- possible next steps

The 37 participants from all over Europe heard several presentations from different perspectives and then discussed in plenary and in parallel working groups. Participants attended in their personal capacity as biodiversity experts. Opinions expressed during the workshop may not necessarily reflect the position of the organisations and institutions represented in the meeting. The aim of the discussion was to share views and opinions and not to strive for consensus. The following discussion points shall **NOT** be seen as an agreed common position of European NGOs nor the German government.

### **Group work on the outcomes of OEWG-1 and post-2020 related SBSTTA documents**

The participants discussed the scope, structure, targets and goals of the Post-2020 Global Biodiversity-Framework based on the following documents:

**CBD/WG2020/1/5**, 30 August 2019 -Report of the Open-ended Working Group on the Post-2020 Global Biodiversity Framework on its first meeting (incl. Annex 1: Possible elements of the Post-2020

Global Biodiversity Framework for further discussion; Annex 2: Preliminary list of meetings, consultations and workshops for the development of Post-2020 Global Biodiversity Framework)

**CBD/SBSTTA/23/2**, 4 October 2019 - Informing the scientific and technical evidence base for the post-2020 global biodiversity framework

**CBD/SBSTTA/23/2/ADD4**, 15 October 2019 - Observations on potential elements for the post-2020 global biodiversity framework (incl. Annex – Possible Target Themes and Elements)

To allow more in-depth discussions, two groups focused on different targets listed in the Annex of CBD/SBSTTA/23/2/ADD4. However, the discussions were referred to the full scope of the key documents.

**The results of the discussion can be summarised as follows:**

## A) General discussion on structure, scope and elements and the process towards the post-2020 global biodiversity framework

### **Development process of the Post-2020 Global Biodiversity Framework (GBF)**

Several participants mentioned that the current development process of the GBF is confusing and not transparent, that the different documents on the GBF seem not to build on each other and are sometimes even partly contradicting, e.g. the list of cross-cutting issues in CBD/WG2020/1/5, Annex 1 and CBD/SBSTTA/23/2/ADD4 are not identical. Further key messages and issues to be considered from the IPBES Global Assessment identified by the CBD Secretariat in CBD/SBSTTA/23/2 (e.g. on p.4 and 5) are not reflected in CBD/SBSTTA/23/2/ADD4.

The development process appears to happen in at least two tracks with documents produced by the CBD Secretariat as well as the Co-Chairs. The role, mandate and output of the planned workshops (as listed in the Annex 2 of the report of OEWG-1) remains unclear and the question was raised, how past and future submissions are or will be included in the development process of the GBF. It was mentioned, that the process could need the support of professional moderators.

The participants called for better alignment of the documents and the process in general and requested clarity regarding the status of the documents and upcoming events. Timely information on how to contribute to the process and the thematic workshops is required.

### **Scope, content and structure (CBD/WG2020/1/5, Annex 1 and CBD/SBSTTA/23/2/ADD4)**

Participants mentioned, that the structure of the goals of the GBF should reflect a Cause-Effect Relationship and/or incorporate the Pressure-State-Response (PSR) framework.

The outcome of the implementation of the GBF should be to “bend the curve” of biodiversity loss, the GBF should show what needs to be done. Participants still see a risk, that the outcome of the Global Biodiversity Framework could be weaker than the Strategic Plan 2011-2020 and the Aichi Targets, based on the current discussions.

It was mentioned, that the GBF should reflect the interrelation of the state of nature and the provision of Nature's Contribution to People (NCPs).

The GBF should not have free floating targets, they should be related to the different levels of the framework and interlinked.

The framework should address all sectors, ministries or departments and not only the one for Environmental Protection/Nature Conservation. The CBD should strive to create ownership of governments to ensure implementation across the sectors.

The formulation "(iv) Not duplicative of other processes" in section D. Goals, targets, sub-targets, and indicators of Annex 1 in CBD/WG2020/1/5 could include the risk, that important issues with a large impact on biodiversity are not addressed in the GBF. It might be justified to address issues covered by other conventions and processes from a biodiversity perspective as well.

Further, the gap and limitation analysis by the CBD Secretariat and by IPBES in CBD/SBSTTA/23/2 e.g. para. 52 or in CBD/SBSTTA/23/2/ADD, para. 20 should be supported. However, it should not be used to postpone any target or goal.

Participants noted the absence of mentioning digital sequence information on genetic resources (DSI) in CBD/SBSTTA/23/2 and CBD/SBSTTA/23/2/ADD4, although a meeting was scheduled in March 2020 to address the question how to address digital sequence information on genetic resources in the context of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework (see CBD/WG2020/1/5, Annex 2.).

Participants mentioned, that implementation of the GBF is not sufficiently reflected in the proposal by the Secretariat (CBD/SBSTTA/23/2/ADD4).

### **2030 Mission**

The participants of the workshop were of the opinion, that the proposed mission text in CBD/SBSTTA/23/2/ADD4, p4, para.13 "*Implement solutions across society to address biodiversity loss and enhance benefits contributing to the global development agenda and, by 2030, putting the world on a path to achieve the 2050 vision.*" is not as ambitious as the 2020 mission because the formulation "Implement solutions ... to address biodiversity loss..." is much weaker than "Take effective and urgent action .... to **halt** biodiversity loss...", and it does not fulfill the criteria set out in para. 12 in the same document. It should be deleted or be rephrased completely.

It was proposed that the 2030 Mission should be phrased around the three objectives of the CBD:

CBD, Article 1. Objectives:

*The objectives of this Convention, to be pursued in accordance with its relevant provisions, are the **conservation of biological diversity, the sustainable use of its components and the fair and equitable sharing of the benefits arising out of the utilization of genetic resources, including by appropriate access to genetic resources and by appropriate transfer of relevant technologies, taking into account all rights over those resources and to technologies, and by appropriate funding.***

## B) Discussion of the goals and targets proposed in CBD/SBSTTA/23/2/ADD4

### B.1 )Goals, Targets and Milestones (Group 1)

**CBD/WG2020/1/5, Annex 1, D. and F.**

#### **CBD/SBSTTA/23/2/ADD4, Annex – Possible Target Themes and Elements**

- Biodiversity and conservation outcomes
- Direct drivers
- Use and value of nature
- Cross-cutting issues

#### **Overarching aspects**

There should be goals/targets for 2030.

These goals and targets should reflect the three objectives of the Convention.

The three objectives should be the basis of the post2020 biodiversity framework.

Different views were provided whether the framework should be structured/sorted in three pillars representing the three objectives or if that is not possible/preferable since the three objectives are interlinked.

It was proposed, that each target (e.g. the ones proposed in the Annex of CBD/SBSTTA/23/2/ADD4) should have a clear link to one or more of the three objectives of the Convention.

Different views were provided on the question whether the goals and targets should strengthen the **natural capital narrative** or Ecosystem Services as GDP of the poor. It was mentioned that IPBES is currently carrying out a methodological assessment on the conceptualization of **values of biodiversity and nature's benefits to people** (<https://www.ipbes.net/values>) that is aiming to develop a more inclusive approach on valuation of nature including economic valuation methods. It was stated, that a deeper understanding on ecosystem services, values of nature, benefits arising from the sustainable use of nature is needed. The GBF should incorporate the value of nature and the interrelation between the state of nature and its contributions to people. The IPBES Global Assessment provides a reference point e.g. with the list of 18 categories of nature's contributions including material, non-material and assistance and regulation nature's contribution to people (NCPs) ([IPBES GA SPM](#), figure 1, page 10).The conservation and use of NCPs need to be translated into policy.

#### **Specific goals and targets**

Participants mentioned, that the CBD has a mandate to address land and marine habitats, however the currently proposed targets by the Secretariat and the Co-Chairs still focus mainly on terrestrial ecosystems.

It was discussed, if the GBF should include an overarching goal or target for 100% **healthy oceans** (inspired by [SDG 14](#)), that could address ocean related issues in a more holistic way e.g. with sub-

targets addressing marine habitats, fishing, marine pollution, plastics, noise, subsidies, blue economy, extractive industries. Such a goal/target could contribute to an overall habitat goal/target.

IPBES identifies land- and sea-use change as one of the main drivers for the loss of biodiversity. After fishing (see IPBES GA SPM, p. 16, para. 12) changes in the uses of the sea and coastal land is the second largest driver for the loss of marine ecosystems. Sea-use change should therefore be reflected in the goals and targets, currently it is not addressed in CBD/SBSTTA/23/2/ADD4.

*“13. The direct driver with the second highest relative impact on the oceans is the many changes in the uses of the sea and coastal land (well established) (Figure SPM.2) {2.2.6.2}. Coastal habitats, including estuaries and deltas critical for marine biota and regional economies, have been severely affected by sea-use changes (coastal development, offshore aquaculture, mariculture and bottom trawling) and land-use changes (onshore land clearance and urban sprawl along coastlines, plus pollution of rivers). [...] (IPBES GA SPM, p. 16, para. 13)*

The question was raised, if there should also be an overarching goal/target on land/land-use. However, participants also mentioned that goals that focus on habitats would contradict the call to have GBF structured along the three objectives of the CBD.

Participants supported the gap analysis done for a **species** related target in CBD/SBSTTA/23/2/ADD4.

The role of **local and indigenous knowledge (ILK)** and **indigenous peoples and local communities (IPLC's)** is reduced to a target on traditional knowledge in CBD/SBSTTA/23/2/ADD4. It should also be considered an overarching /cross-cutting issue (see CBD/WG2020/1/5, Annex 1) and it is important that targets relating to IPLC's and ILK contain explicit references hereto. A target on traditional knowledge should also include further elements, for instance the recognition of contributions and collective actions of IPLC's, their full and effective participation in implementing the Convention (including national reporting and NBSAP's), their customary sustainable use, land tenure/rights, food security/food systems, capacity building and resource mobilization (the two latter might be separate targets – as well as national reporting and NBSAP's– if so, special reference should be made to IPLC's).

The conclusions of IPBES summarised in SBSTTA/23/2, p. 4, para 20 *“Each of the assessments highlights the importance of governance and enabling actions including recognition of the roles and rights of indigenous peoples and local communities.”* and p.5, para 23. (h) should be reflected in the GBF. Further, the zero draft of the GBF should reflect the recommendations of the eleventh meeting of the Ad Hoc Open-ended Working Group on Article 8(j) and Related Provisions of the Convention on Biological Diversity (WG8J), taking place in Montreal, Canada, before SBSTTA-23.

**Human rights** aspects are not sufficiently reflected in the targets proposed in CBD/SBSTTA/23/2/ADD4 (compare SBSTTA 23/2, e.g. p.5, para. 23, (e) *“Ensuring inclusive decision-making, fair and equitable sharing of benefits arising from the use of and adherence to human rights in conservation decisions”*). To include and implement a human rights-based approach would also strengthen the collaboration between the CBD and relevant UN fora/institutions (promoting and monitoring human rights). A target on a human rights based approach should be informed by e.g. the UN Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples (UNDRIP). Other rights based processes can also inform the development of other targets e.g. the UN guiding principles on Business and Human Rights could frame and inform content on elements/targets on tele-coupling and the UN Human

Rights Covenants (ICCPR etc.) could frame and inform elements/targets on legislation/laws/regulations and policies (as tools and/or implementation mechanisms).

The **links between nature and culture** as e.g. described in CBD/SBSTTA/23/4 and the IPBES Global Assessment are not sufficiently reflected so far in CBD/SBSTTA/23/2/ADD4.

The **main sectors** responsible for land-use change and other drivers are not pointed out in the targets on direct drivers in CBD/SBSTTA/23/2/ADD4. **Agriculture and other sectors** should be clearly addressed. See e.g. IPBES GA SPM, p.16, para 11. *“Land-use change is driven primarily by agriculture, forestry and urbanization, all of which are associated with air, water and soil pollution. [...]”*

SBSTTA 23/2 mentions several aspects in paras 21 (e) to 23 (h) which are not reflected in the goals/targets so far (e.g. the evolution of global financial and economic systems towards a globally sustainable economy, developing incentives and widespread capacity for environmental responsibility and eliminating perverse incentives, reforming sectoral and segmented decision-making to promote integration across sectors and jurisdictions, investments as policy tool...).

Participants raised the question, how the GBF could contribute to a just transition of the sectors.

### **Cross-cutting issues**

As mentioned above, the list of cross-cutting issues in CBD/SBSTTA/23/2/ADD4 is not as comprehensive as the ones identified in CBD/WG2020/1/5, Annex 1. Only gender and biosafety are mentioned, while section F. Cross-cutting issues and approaches in CBD/WG2020/1/5, Annex 1 identifies seven overarching issues.

**Mainstreaming** should be also considered under the cross-cutting issues.

**Climate change (and biodiversity)** should also be considered a cross-cutting issue and shouldn't be tackled solely under the UNFCCC but also under the CBD, since it goes beyond the scope of the UNFCCC.

**Local and indigenous knowledge (ILK) and indigenous peoples and local communities (IPLC's)** should be considered cross-cutting issues in addition to a specific target.

## **B.2) Enabling Conditions and Means of Implementation (Group 2)**

### **CBD/SBSTTA/23/2/ADD4, Annex – Possible Target Themes and Elements**

- Tools, solutions and leverage points
- Enabling conditions

#### **Tools, solutions and leverage points**

The categories in this section are blurry – some are issues, some are tools. There is a mixture of direct and indirect drivers, enabling conditions, measurable targets. **Targets and enabling conditions need to be better structured and brought into useful relation to each other.** All listed elements are important – but not all usable as SMART targets. (see e.g. para. 16 “Targets are defined as “SMART”: Three statements that capture what we want to achieve or do within a specific time period towards long-term goals. They can be applied to biodiversity, actions, human benefits, or even relevant aspects of the means of implementation.” and footnote 3 in CBD/SBSTTA/23/2/ADD4.)

**Tackle sustainable consumption and production (SCP)** – the majority in the group was supportive. The targets should be ambitious – SCP is a key element, although the inclusion may be politically difficult.

Participants expressed positive views on **stronger laws and policies** (See Target on Laws, regulations and policies CBD/SBSTTA/23/2/ADD4).

**A temple-like structure** was proposed with separate pillars that support each other: measurable targets, enabling conditions, etc.

Participants observed, that **awareness** and **value of biodiversity** are addressed in separate targets on the proposed list and considered it problematic since the two issues are interlinked. (see Aichi Target 1: *“By 2020, at the latest, people are aware of the values of biodiversity and the steps they can take to conserve and use it sustainably.”*)

It was highlighted, that **mainstreaming** is not prominently covered, but should be reflected (see section on cross-cutting issues above).

Participants noticed, that the list of targets is addressing **different levels of national policy**, this should be considered in the structure of the GBF.

### **Incentives**

Participants referred to the analysis of Aichi Target 3 in CBD/SBSTTA/23/2/ADD4, which is **combining negative and positive incentives. It was seen as important** to get rid of harmful incentives and strengthen good incentives (see also “levers” for transformative change identified by IPBES as presented in para 22. in CBD/SBSTTA/23/2“(a) *Developing incentives and widespread capacity for environmental responsibility and eliminating perverse incentives*”). Clear next steps or milestones are needed. A target/milestone should be concrete and induce action of parties e.g. every party should develop **a subsidy reform plan**. The wording of the key terms is important – perverse incentives versus subsidies since incentives is a much broader term than subsidies. In addition, it was highlighted that incentives are not only financial, and a target/milestone could address financial incentives as well as broader incentives as drivers separately. It was proposed, that incentives and disincentives could be collected (e.g. mechanisms, cost-efficiency, implications).

Participants concluded that a target on this issue is highly important, however it may be difficult to address, and political buy in/will is critical for the implementation.

### **Sustainable consumption and production (SCP)**

Participants questioned if the issue should be addressed under “Tools, solutions and leverage points”. The entire structure of the section was considered problematic as mentioned above. The majority in the group was of the opinion, that there should be a target on SCP. However, it was also discussed that SCP has a cross-cutting nature and that the scope of the CBD has limits and cannot cover every issue. Issues such as SCP might be better placed under another convention or process e.g. SDG 12. One argument voiced pessimism and noted the breath of the issue going way beyond CBD, other arguments pushed for the need of ambition and to address it under the GBF. It was also mentioned, that sustainable use of biodiversity and nature’s contribution to people remains one of the three objectives of the CBD.

Participants proposed to **specifically mention the sectors that impact biodiversity loss** – Agriculture, Fisheries, etc. Sectors need to be included in order to come to valuable targets (see comments on cross-cutting issues and sectors above). Buy in was seen as critical, as this would go beyond the usual remedy of the CBD. **Political, private, public buy in** is necessary, the GBF should involve other ministries in accountability, reach out and create commitments. To anchor the GBF at high political level is also critical and involvement of sectors/ministries beyond environment is required.

A target on SCP should relate to and involve **CITES** to acknowledge the links between illegal trade and consumption of threatened species.

**Tele-coupling issues should be addressed under a SCP target**, since the approach includes where products are produced and where they are consumed. (See also SBSTTA/23/2, para 23 “(f) *Accounting for nature deterioration from local economic activities and socioeconomic-environmental interactions over distances (tele-couplings), including, for example, international trade*”).

### **Enabling Conditions**

National planning processes don't fit with the rest of the section, as they are tools while other elements are means of implementation. Most points listed are cross-cutting relating to actual targets. Participants raised the question, if national planning should be a target, if a national planning target could be SMART or if it is rather a tool to translate targets into actions. Different arguments were raised e.g. to underline SMART targets with tools and means of implementation instead of making them targets themselves. From a developing countries' point of view it could be important to consider national planning as a tool for many targets in order to apply for GEF money in support of national planning. On the other hand, national planning processes should be undertaken since it provides an indication if implementation is moving forward, therefore it should be formulated as a target. A rationale and further explanation of the list of elements in this section may be needed.

### **Resource Mobilization**

It was considered difficult to have resource mobilization (RM) as a target on its own. It should link to other targets and respective implementation plans since **funds will only flow for clear processes/projects**, esp. private sector funds. On the other hand, a clear RM-target may become critical to success and the adoption of the GBF in Kunming. Resource Mobilization **should not only consider financial resources** – all kinds of resources should be included. It was raised that it is **difficult to put down concrete numbers in relation to other targets, since they may move forward** over time (if subsidies are phased out, less money will be needed). However, **reducing subsidies does not necessarily free up more money** for the CBD, therefore these two issues should be addressed separately in the GBF.

In general, it was stated, that **more effective/efficient spending is important** (not only pledging more money), since it is crucial how and where the resources are spent.