

Post-2020 global biodiversity framework: commitment, implementation and accountability

8 October 2019, Hotel Sofitel Brussels Europe, Brussels, Belgium

Background documentation and key resources

The purpose of the following notes and draft questions is to help participants prepare for the meeting through identifying key information sources and summarising key issues. The notes are not intended to be comprehensive nor to express any positions, and are merely presented in order to promote further discussion. We recognise that the four discussion topics are closely related, and as a result some of the issues raised here under one topic – and the sources identified – may well also be relevant to discussion on a different topic.

If you experience difficulties in accessing any of the sources identified, please contact
jerry.harrison@unep-wcmc.org

General background

The workshop is taking place less than two months after the first meeting of the open-ended working group on post-2020 convened by the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD). There has been significant consultation and sharing of views on the form and content of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework and the associated enabling activities, although to date no explicit decisions have yet been taken.

Given the wealth of discussion that has already taken place, and the urgency of the problem, it is important that this workshop builds on previous discussion and does not just repeat what has already been said before. Hence the many links in this document to other sources.

Given the value of open and frank discussion, this meeting will operate under the spirit of the Chatham House Rule, and nothing will be done outside the meeting to identify who said what.

It is assumed that all participants will be familiar with:

- The [CBD COP decision 14/34](#) which established the process for developing the post-2020 global biodiversity framework, including the annex to that decision.
- The draft outcomes of the first meeting of the open ended working group, including the [report](#), the [conclusions](#), the [annex](#) to the conclusions, and the non-paper on [possible elements](#) of a post-2020 global biodiversity framework for further discussion. When available final versions will be posted [here](#).
- Recent discussion under the Convention with respect to review of implementation (see for example documents [CBD/COP/14/5](#), [CBD/COP/14/5/Add.1](#) and [CBD/COP/14/5/Add.2](#)) which communicates some of the concerns over the pace of implementation and gaps.

Other useful resources for discussion include:

- The many [submissions](#) made by Parties and observers over the last year, which between then set out the range of views that have been expressed concerning the form and content of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework and its future implementation. Syntheses of the views expressed in the submissions are in documents [CBD/POST2020/PREP/1/INF/2](#) and [CBD/POST2020/PREP/1/INF/1](#).
- Other documents prepared as part of the post-2020 process, including the reports of the regional consultations, and the consultation/expert meetings focused on the Protocols, gender, and on working with the other biodiversity-related conventions. All documents can be found at www.cbd.int/post2020.

- The Trondheim Conference co-chairs' report from the ninth [Trondheim Conference on Biodiversity](#), which focused on support for the post-2020 process. Abstracts and presentations can also be found on the conference website, together with discussion group outcomes.
- Discussions relating to scenarios for achieving the 2050 Vision (see for example CBD COP [decision 14/2](#) and working document [CBD/SBSTTA/21/2](#) and the associated information documents).
- Documents and presentations from the [Second Bogis Bossey Dialogue for Biodiversity](#), which focused on motivations and opportunities for transformative change.

Topic 1	Commitment: NBSAPs and other national commitments that respond to the Convention and its Protocols, and to the post-2020 global biodiversity framework
<p>Summary of key issues:</p> <p>Parties use NBSAPs as a key tool for framing their commitments to addressing the objectives of the Convention and successive strategic plans, and for planning action. Most Parties have NBSAPs in place that will remain operational for some years to come.</p> <p>Given the urgency of effective action, it is important to maintain and further increase the momentum generated by preparing and adopting the post-2020 global biodiversity framework. This will need to build on existing NBSAPs as well as any commitments and other initiatives generated during the preparatory process.</p> <p>Despite the need for urgent action to address biodiversity loss, yet there is a real concern that current efforts are insufficient. For example, analysis by the CBD Secretariat suggests that many of the current NBSAPs do not yet embody the level of ambition that is necessary for attaining the 2050 Vision for Biodiversity.</p> <p>However, a major challenge for assessing commitment and level of ambition is the variability in content and level of detail from one NBSAP to another, including the extent to which biodiversity-related commitments made in other sectors (for example in response to climate change or land degradation) are taken into account. This latter point underlines the value of NBSAPs as a framework for all biodiversity-related commitment and action at the national level, addressing not only the CBD and its Protocols, but also the other biodiversity-related conventions, and other conventions and process that impact on and benefit from biodiversity.</p> <p style="text-align: right;"><i>Note the opportunity to discuss review and reporting during the afternoon sessions.</i></p>	
<p>Suggested questions that the workshop will address:</p> <p>a) How can the NBSAP process be strengthened, at national and international levels, taking into account the Sustainable Development Goals, biodiversity-related MEAs and actions in other fora (climate, land degradation, etc.), and their biodiversity benefits and impacts?</p> <p>b) What mechanisms or instruments could be put in place at the international level to ensure that Parties' actions are sufficiently ambitious, helping to achieve post-2020 targets and milestones, and lead to progress towards the 2050 Vision?</p> <p>c) Are there ways in which each Party's commitments (whether in NBSAPs or not) could be more clearly and consistently expressed so that the information can be more readily compiled and analysed?</p>	
<p>It is assumed that all participants will be familiar with:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The form and content of at least one NBSAP (see for example the strategy and action plan for Finland, or the NBSAP for Egypt), and the ways in which NBSAPs are intended to be used to implement the Convention at the national level (see www.cbd.int/nbsap), while recognising that form, content and implementation can vary significantly from one Party to another. • The variety of guidance on preparation of NBSAPs and on their content and implementation provided by the CBD COP, and the range of other guidance currently available, as summarised on the CBD website in order to support Parties in their preparation of NBSAPs (recognising that the need for enhanced guidance was an issue discussed at the first meeting of the open ended working group). • COP 14 documents relating to progress in the review of implementation, in particular paragraphs 11-20 on NBSAPs in CBD/COP/14/5, Section IV of CBD/COP/14/5/Add.1 (which is an analysis of contents of NBSAPs), and Figure 1 in CBD/COP/14/5/Add.2 which illustrates and analysis of targets in NBSAPs (the analysis by the CBD Secretariat referred to above). 	

Other useful resources for discussion include:

- The [assessment of post-2010 NBSAPs](#) prepared by Cristian Prip and Balakrishna Pisupati for UNEP reviews issues such as preparation and adoption approaches, the treatment of mainstreaming, the use of national targets, NBSAPs as tools for implementing other conventions, and both legal and financial preparedness.
- The UNDP paper on [NBSAPs as natural catalysts for accelerating action on SDGs](#) is a recognition of the importance of the link between biodiversity and the SDGs, and seeks to identify NBSAPs as both a tool and opportunity for addressing biodiversity in the context of delivering the SDGs.
- The draft papers prepared as contributions to a post-2020 EU biodiversity strategy by UNEP-WCMC ([Reversing negative biodiversity trends through action: What is needed to bend the curve](#)) and the European Environment Agency ([Review of the existing quantitative national targets in NBSAPs of European countries](#))
- In relation to commitments made in other fora that can have biodiversity benefits and impacts and that should be considered in the context of NBSAPs, the WWF paper on [NDCs – a force for nature?](#), and the policy briefs from the [Nature-based Solutions Initiative](#), provide valuable food for thought.
- Effective biodiversity governance is essential to NBSAP implementation, and UNEP has provided a review paper (2018) on [law and NBSAPs](#) which considers legal preparedness, strengthening and sustaining legal preparedness in NBSAPs, and review of legal considerations within NBSAPs.
- Section 6 of the UNEP [Sourcebook on opportunities for enhancing cooperation among the biodiversity-related conventions at national and regional levels](#) addresses the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020, the Aichi Biodiversity Targets and NBSAPs.
- Given the discussion at the open-ended working group in Nairobi on the need for enhanced guidance for developing and reviewing NBSAPs, it may also be useful to be aware of the [NBSAP Capacity Building Modules](#) on the CBD website, and links to other capacity building resources.

Topic 2	Implementation: National reports as a means for tracking implementation and achievement of commitments made through NBSAPs and other mechanisms
<p>Summary of key issues:</p> <p>Parties regularly produce national reports on implementation of the Convention and its Protocols, following agreed formats intended to ensure key issues are covered and to encourage a degree of comparability. The format and periodicity or reporting is not fixed, and can be modified in order to improve the value of reports and reporting.</p> <p>Significant effort is put into reporting by Parties, but concerns have been expressed that the reporting process and the use of reported information is less effective than it might be. With the development of a post-2020 global biodiversity framework, and renewed discussions on accountability and transparency, now might be an opportunity for review and adjusting reporting systems. Guidance and support could also be enhanced.</p> <p>Parties also report to other intergovernmental conventions and processes, and it is likely that in a number of cases information reported to these bodies will also be relevant to delivery of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework. Indeed there have been concerns expressed on many occasions of the potential for duplication and inefficiencies in reporting across the various biodiversity-related Conventions and other relevant agreements and initiatives.</p> <p>As a result of the above there are calls for increased coordination in reporting across multiple agreements and processes, and for further development and use of tools to support reporting such as online reporting systems and the evolving Data Reporting Tool for MEAs (DART).</p> <p>The post-2020 global biodiversity framework could provide a valuable framework for capturing information from multiple sources, including reporting. However in the past reporting has not always been helped by the wording and format of targets, and in particular the current mix of targets for outcomes, pressures and drivers of loss, and actions.</p> <p><i>Note the opportunity to build on the morning discussion on NBSAPs and other national commitments.</i></p>	

Suggested questions that the workshop will address:

- a) What steps can be taken to improve reporting processes within the Convention and its Protocols, so that delivery of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework can be more effectively tracked?
- b) How can we ensure that relevant information is captured from the reporting associated with other relevant conventions and processes (e.g. Agenda 2030) in the most efficient/effective manner?
- c) How can we capture the multiple contributions made by other actors, including non-Parties, NGOs, IPLCs and the private sector, building on the Sharm El Sheikh to Kunming Action Agenda and other commitment processes?

It is assumed that all participants will be familiar with:

- The form and content of the sixth national report (see for example the report for [Finland](#) or from [Egypt](#)), the [template and guidelines](#) for the sixth report, and the associated [resource manual](#).
- CBD COP [Decision 14/27](#) on process for aligning national reporting, assessment and review, and document [CBD/SBI/2/12](#) on national reporting under the convention and its protocols.
- The extent to which information from national reports is used in the reviews of implementation periodically prepared by the CBD Secretariat (see for example [CBD/COP/14/5](#), [CBD/COP/14/5/Add.1](#) and [CBD/COP/14/5/Add.2](#)), or the [Global Biodiversity Outlook](#) (noting also CBD COP [decision 14/35](#) on the importance of national reports to preparation of the fifth edition).

Other useful resources for discussion include:

- The report prepared by UNEP-WCMC and NatureConsult with the support of Switzerland on Elements for a Modular Reporting against the Aichi Biodiversity Targets ([UNEP/CBD/COP/13/INF/24](#))
- The draft guidance provided by the CBD Secretariat in [CBD/COP/14/INF/26](#) for reporting progress on biodiversity to the High-level Political Forum through Voluntary National Reviews (noting that Voluntary National Reviews themselves can be found [here](#), and the associated guidelines [here](#)).
- The concept note on the [Data Reporting Tool for MEAs](#) (DART), and description of the [Online Reporting System](#) used by a number of conventions (noting that the CBD online reporting is described documents identified above).
- The tools provided by [InforMEA](#) which allow for search across data and information managed by secretariats of international agreements (see for example [search across national reports](#)).
- Tools such as the [UN Biodiversity Lab](#) and the Biodiversity Indicators [Dashboard](#), which are intended to increase access to data at the national level.
- Annotated lists of key information sources identified in the [Compendium of guidance on key global datasets related to biodiversity conventions](#) and [Compendium of guidance on capturing, managing and using data and information](#) (prepared with support from the European Union and the CBD Secretariat).

Topic 3	Learning from review and reporting under other intergovernmental processes, where national efforts to address global commitments and accountability are encouraged
<p>Summary of key issues:</p> <p>COP14 agreed that SBI-3 would further consider options for enhancing review mechanisms, with a view to strengthening implementation of the Convention. Enhancing review mechanisms has been under discussion for some time. In addition to the voluntary peer review of NBSAPs, at SBI-3 a new mechanism based on voluntary review reports by Parties will be tested.</p> <p>Other intergovernmental agreements and processes use a range of different approaches for reporting on and reviewing national efforts to address global commitments, and there may be lessons to be learnt relevant to implementation of the Convention and its Protocols. Such lessons might relate to reviewing implementation, increasing political commitment, ‘ratcheting up’ of national targets, and so on.</p> <p>The ultimate aim to improve implementation, and to develop a mechanism (or mechanisms) that encourage and support such improvement, including identifying where enabling conditions need to be enhanced.</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><i>Note the opportunity to build on the morning discussion on NBSAPs and other national commitments.</i></p>	

Suggested questions that the workshop will address:

- a) Which approaches to transparent implementation review and reporting used by other intergovernmental processes might be considered further as possible models for the Convention and its Protocols now or in the future?
- b) To what extent, or for which types of issues
 - is a technical review sufficient?
 - is it sufficient to understand state of implementation and gaps towards global/national targets?
 - should review mechanisms focus on identifying best practices and show-casing achievements?
 - could review mechanisms focus on building political pressure for stepping up implementation?
 - could review mechanisms include options to trigger additional support where it is needed?

It is assumed that all participants will be familiar with:

- CBD COP [decision 14/29](#) on review mechanisms, and the two SBI documents which have substantively addressed this issue, in particular [CBD/SBI/2/11](#) and [UNEP/CBD/SBI/1/10/Add.3](#) on mechanisms to facilitate review of implementation.

Other useful resources for discussion include:

- An [issue brief on review and accountability mechanisms](#) of selected international agreements to inform the development of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework, developed by UNEP-WCMC
- The presentations and documents prepared for the “Friends of the CBD” workshop on mechanisms to support review of implementation of the Convention (www.cbd.int/meetings/IMPWS-2016-01), and the report of that meeting ([UNEP/CBD/SBI/1/INF/50](#))
- Amongst the biodiversity- related conventions, these presentations include brief description of the [review mechanisms under CMS](#) and its daughter agreements, and [review mechanisms under CITES](#).

Topic 4	Accountability and transparency - tracking and reporting on delivery of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework at the global level
<p>Summary of key issues:</p> <p>Assessing progress in delivery of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework will require a suite of global indicators, building on experience gained in using indicators under the Convention over the past nearly 20 years. This helps to track both actions (for example protected areas) and outcomes (for example ecosystem extent or species status). In developing the refreshed suite of indicators it will also be valuable to consider further the relationship to other processes using indicators, including IPBES, other MEAs and tracking the SDGs.</p> <p>However it is also important to track levels of ambition, so that we know whether we are on target to deliver the post-2020 global biodiversity framework, and ultimately to achieve the 2050 Vision for Biodiversity. In order to do this it will be important to more effectively review the commitments that Parties and others have made, and to analyse them, so that an assessment can be made of the extent to which the commitments made demonstrate a sufficient level of ambition to ensure progress on the path to the 2050 Vision on Biodiversity. This will be an important part of any concerted effort to increase ambition and to increase implementation.</p> <p>Transparent understanding of sufficiency of commitments and progress towards them will require a clear understanding of whether targets are addressing intended outcomes, actions to be undertaken, or enabling conditions. It is important to recognise that such an analysis or assessment requires an understanding of the baselines upon which these commitments build.</p> <p><i>Note the opportunity to build on the morning discussion on NBSAPs and other national commitments.</i></p>	
<p>Suggested questions that the workshop will address:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">a) Can we further strengthen the use of indicators so that they provide a more effective way of tracking both implementation and achievement of targets at all levels, and if so how?b) What information do we need in order to assess whether the commitments made by Parties through whatever means (NBSAPs, etc.) add up to delivery of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework?	

c) Where does the necessary information for assessing the total commitment – the add-up-ability of national commitments – come from, and how can we ensure efficient information flows so that the key information is available?

It is assumed that all participants will be familiar with:

- The use of indicators to track progress in achievement of the Aichi Biodiversity Targets, as agreed in CBD COP [decision XIII/28](#) and described in its Annex (which also identifies where these indicators are used as SDG indicators).
- Current approaches to review of implementation carried out by the CBD Secretariat, as set out in COP 14 documents [CBD/COP/14/5](#), [CBD/COP/14/5/Add.1](#) and [CBD/COP/14/5/Add.2](#).

Other useful resources for discussion include:

- The report of the [OECD Expert Workshop on the Post-2020 Biodiversity Framework](#), which looked at targets, indicators and measurability implications at global and national level.
- The information document prepared for CBD COP 14 on Developing indicators for the post-2020 global biodiversity framework: Lessons from the Biodiversity Indicators Partnership ([CBD/COP/14/INF/40](#))
- The table [mapping of current and potential use of biodiversity indicators across intergovernmental processes](#) developed by UNEP-WCMC with the support of Finland, which looks at indicators across CBD, SDGs, Ramsar, CITES, CMS and IPBES.
- The draft papers prepared as contributions to a post-2020 EU biodiversity strategy by UNEP-WCMC ([Reversing negative biodiversity trends through action: What is needed to bend the curve](#)) and the European Environment Agency ([Review of the existing quantitative national targets in NBSAPs of European countries](#))
- The [synthesis report on the aggregate effect of the intended nationally determined contributions](#) prepared by the UNFCCC secretariat, which is one of the key documents for governments to understand their collective effort on climate change and to shape the discussions and negotiations in Paris.
- The [Emissions Gap Report](#) produced by UNEP, which presents an assessment of current national mitigation efforts and the ambitions countries have presented in their NDCs.
- The [Sharm El-Sheik to Beijing Action Agenda for Nature and People](#) and the policy brief on [Opportunities for the Action Agenda for Nature and People](#) published by PBL.