



Convention on Biological Diversity

Distr.
GENERAL

CBD/POST2020/WS/2019/5/2
19 June 2019

ORIGINAL: ENGLISH

REPORT OF THE REGIONAL CONSULTATION ON THE POST-2020 GLOBAL BIODIVERSITY FRAMEWORK FOR LATIN AMERICA AND THE CARIBBEAN, MONTEVIDEO, 14-17 MAY 2019

I. BACKGROUND AND PURPOSE

1. The Conference of the Parties to the Convention on Biological Diversity at its fourteenth meeting adopted decision [14/34](#) on the preparatory process for the development of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework and requested the Executive Secretary to facilitate the implementation of the process. In order to support the preparation of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework, an open-ended intersessional working group was established and Mr. Francis Ogwal (Uganda) and Mr. Basile van Havre (Canada) were designated as co-chairs of the working group.

2. In decision 14/34, paragraph 6, the Conference of the Parties urged Parties and invited other Governments and stakeholders to “actively engage and contribute to the process of developing a robust post-2020 global biodiversity framework in order to foster strong ownership of the framework to be agreed and strong support for its immediate implementation”. Therefore, it was agreed that regional and thematic consultation workshops would take place as a platform for the discussions.

3. The Regional Consultation on the Post-2020 Global Biodiversity Framework for the Latin America and Caribbean Group was held in Montevideo from 14 to 17 May 2019. The workshop was organized by the Secretariat of the Convention on Biological Diversity in collaboration with the Ministry of Housing, Territorial Planning and Environment of Uruguay and under the guidance of the Co-Chairs of the Open-ended Working Group. The workshop was attended by representatives of the Parties to the Convention from the region as well as relevant organizations.¹ The workshop was conducted in Spanish and English with sessions in plenary and break-out groups. Several events also took place on the margins of the Consultation, including a reception hosted by the Ministry and a high-level dinner event hosted by the World Wildlife Fund on the New Deal for Nature campaign.

4. The present report details the discussions of the Consultation as they relate to the development of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework. Section III provides an account of the proceedings.

II. VIEWS OF PARTICIPANTS THE SCOPE AND CONTENT ON THE POST-2020 GLOBAL BIODIVERSITY FRAMEWORK

5. The following is a synthesis of the range of views expressed on the possible content and scope of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework arising from the discussions during the regional consultation workshop for Latin America and the Caribbean. The synthesis provides an overview of the broad range of perspectives and views expressed. It should not be interpreted as a consensus but, rather, as input for further discussions in the development of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework, without excluding any additional ideas expressed through submissions by Parties and relevant organizations.

¹ The list of participants in the workshop is accessible from
<https://www.cbd.int/doc/c/7072/38f3/2ad7fa7071ba3815a8aa593a/post2020-ws-2019-05-info-note-en.pdf>

A. Opportunities and challenges for the post-2020 global framework resulting from the implementation of the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020 in the region

6. Participants were asked to reflect on the opportunities and challenges for the post-2020 global biodiversity framework, and on the strengths and weaknesses of the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020.

7. With regard to challenges, the lack of, or insufficiency of resources (including financial, human, institutional, technical and data-related resources) was noted, as was the lack of mainstreaming of biodiversity into productive sectors, and intersectoral coordination. Likewise, it was agreed that communication and awareness, particularly of the importance of biodiversity to people, were major challenges and opportunities. Setting realistic global targets (that are quantifiable) with practical indicators was also mentioned repeatedly either as a challenge or as an opportunity. In that respect, it was suggested that the Cartagena and Nagoya Protocols should be reflected in a new set of targets.

8. The lack of political will and good governance and the existence of competing national priorities were brought up as a persistent challenge in the region. Groups also mentioned issues of inclusion, security, justice, conflicts relating to rights of use of biodiversity and ecosystems, and the need for a rights-based approach. The ratification and implementation of the recently signed [Escazú Agreement on Access to Information, Public Participation and Justice in Environmental Matters in Latin America and the Caribbean](#) was cited as an opportunity for the region. Various participants also emphasized the importance of participation of indigenous peoples and local communities, women, youth, the private sector and citizens in decision-making.

9. The fact that Latin America and the Caribbean is one of the richest regions in biodiversity and traditional knowledge is an opportunity for the region. Some groups added that it is important to find ways to turn this advantage into economic opportunity, and to ensure that benefits are equally distributed. It was noted that “we are not starting from zero”, indicating that there is already a great deal of ongoing work, and that many examples of good practices already exist.

10. Achieving more balance among the three objectives of the Convention, particularly enhancing the second, on sustainable use, and the third, on equitable sharing of benefits, was mentioned, as was, more explicitly, the implementation of the Nagoya Protocol.

11. It was agreed that synergies with other conventions and multilateral agreements, including but not limited to the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change, the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development, the International Treaty on Plant Genetic Resources for Food and Agriculture and the Hazardous Chemicals and Waste Conventions, were a major opportunity, as were the United Nations Environment Assembly and regional ministerial forums on environment. In that respect, it was suggested that closer integration of reporting requirements could be helpful.

12. Most participants noted that the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020 and the Aichi Biodiversity Targets had been useful for catalysing and guiding action at the national level (and the subnational), that they helped to raise awareness about the importance of biodiversity, and that they helped when approaching other sectors for longer-term biodiversity planning. It was also noted that, in the post-2020 global biodiversity framework, there should be some continuity with the Strategic Plan in order to not lose time starting from zero.

13. Some participants highlighted the need to regulate new emerging technologies, such as synthetic biology, and the use of digital sequence information on genetic resources, among others.

14. Several improvements to the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020 could be considered for the post-2020 framework. They include: (a) enhanced implementation of NBSAPs, their approval at the highest levels of government, and integration into the work programmes of other ministries; (b) more realistic, clearer and quantifiable targets and indicators; (c) better integration of the second and third objectives of the Convention; (d) finance for implementation; (e) a strong review mechanism; (f) a

mechanism for the participation and commitments of non-State actors; and (g) specific targets on ecosystem restoration and resource mobilization.

Visioning the world we want

15. Participants reflected on the vision of the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020 – “Living in Harmony with Nature” – and discussed what this vision means in concrete terms and what would need to change to make it a reality by 2050.

16. Many participants agreed that “transformational change” is necessary to attain the 2050 Vision. This includes fundamental changes in social and economic systems including changes in the predominant development model, a move away from a linear economy, the use of alternatives to gross domestic product (GDP) as measures of development and well-being (integrating biodiversity into the measures of social and economic well-being) and placing biodiversity at the centre of decision-making, considering the different dynamics of socio-ecological systems to ensure sustainable transitions. For others, the transformational change needed is in the way people think and view biodiversity, in a change of paradigm where nature and people are one and avoid commoditization of nature if we want to reach the 2050 vision. Some emphasized the need to go back to “our” roots, to see nature, culture and identity together. It was also suggested that people’s behaviours need to move towards responsible and informed consumption, giving the productive and service sectors (including the financial sector) a motivation to move to alternatives that integrate conservation and sustainable use actions, and social responsibility. In order to attain this type of transformation in people’s behaviours, many suggested that information, awareness and education campaigns need to be enhanced.

17. The issue of rights was also brought up numerous times in different veins. For some, it was important to recognize the rights of nature; for others, it was the rights of (all) people to sustainable development. For still others, it was the right of future generations to a healthy planet. Some mentioned the need to recognize indigenous peoples’ and local communities’ management of their territories, and their contributions to the implementation of the three objectives of the Convention. It was also mentioned that the rights and security of indigenous peoples and local communities need to be recognized. Part of the discussion around rights touched on the issue of inclusive governance and the empowerment of people to participate in decisions relating to the environment.

18. Several groups addressed the need for evidence-based decision making, for there to be the political will to use existing knowledge and scientific evidence, such as the recently released IPBES regional and global assessments, as well as traditional knowledge, and socio-ecological analysis. There was also a call for more research and data collection.

19. Some participants identified several elements of or relating specifically to the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020 that could be improved in the post-2020 framework. These included:

- (a) A compliance and review mechanism for national contributions;
- (b) Means of implementation that are effective and readily available;
- (c) Synergies among Conventions;
- (d) More ambitious targets – numerical, qualitative, social well-being indicators;
- (e) Integration of the 2050 Vision into all sectors;
- (f) Demonstrated, concrete, successful cases of fair and equitable distribution of benefits derived from access to genetic resources;
- (g) Effective inclusion of private and business sectors;
- (h) Reactivation of the Island Biodiversity Framework Programme of Work.

20. There was also a recognition that the current vision as part of the existing Strategic Plan is not an urgent enough call to action in the short run by virtue of its date being 30 years away, and that this makes it

imperative that the post-2020 framework have a mission or a series of milestones at various time intervals between 2020 and 2050 that are strong and immediate calls to action.

B. Elements for a post-2020 framework and 2050 Vision

21. During the workshop, participants shared ideas on the possible scope and content of different elements of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework:

1. Structure of the framework

22. Participants identified two scenarios for the post-2020 global framework: A complete structural reformation, or a revision of the current structure for greater effectiveness and to better encompass what is included in the action plan. Many participants leaned towards the second option, preferring to maintain the current strategy with updated mission and goals. This could include a long-term central objective, enabling conditions (such as mainstreaming, resource mobilization) and standardized universal indicators to facilitate evaluation. Participants also discussed the possibilities of embedding the framework within either the 2030 Agenda (with a global evaluation in 2025) or the 2050 Vision.

23. Some suggestions relating to the structure of the framework were made:

(a) To address the direct and indirect drivers of biodiversity loss identified by the IPBES Global Assessment in the plan and give importance to the sustainable use of biodiversity and its integration in the sectors;

(b) To formulate a mission, vision and guiding principles that create linkages with the Sustainable Development Goals and with other conventions;

(c) To align the conceptual framework of the Convention on Biological Diversity with that of IPBES, so that the latter can better feed its assessment of compliance with goals;

(d) To include a section on guiding principles (gender, intergenerational justice, human and nature rights, precautionary principle);

(e) To create a diagram to make the interrelations between objectives, goals, Sustainable Development Goals and nationally determined contributions explicit;

(f) To produce a unifying document that can be used by all actors and stakeholders;

(g) To identify a set of actions or measures for transformational change and allow all actors and stakeholders to contribute to its consecution.

2. Objectives and goals for biological diversity

24. A point of agreement among participants was the need for better cohesiveness and greater clarity in the goals and targets. There was a debate on whether specific targets for gender and indigenous peoples and local communities should be included, or if it would suffice to express them in terms of indicators only.

25. Participants made the following suggestions in relation to the objectives and goals:

(a) To highlight the interlinkages between goals, targets and other conventions or agreements that also address biodiversity issues;

(b) To review the targets with little achievements and redefine them (for example: review target 18 to guarantee the recognition and accountability of indigenous peoples and local communities);

(c) To have scaled goals, based in scientific evidence and traditional knowledge and create sub-goals to disaggregate certain components;

(d) To adjust the Aichi Targets to reflect the five guiding principles of IPBES;

(e) To include a goal on the correspondence with the decade on restoration;

(f) To have a main goal, or a very limited set of main goals, to facilitate communication and engagement processes.

26. Furthermore, some participants highlighted the need to have a tailored approach. They suggested that SMART criteria could be applied only to countries that have the necessary monitoring and evaluating capacities. They also suggested that goals and targets could be made specifically for zones with major biodiversity, as well as centres of origin and genetic diversification, since challenges are the greatest in megadiverse countries.

3. *Relationship with the Protocols*

27. The need to create a cohesive connection between the plans, the Protocols and the framework was discussed. Some participants believe it is necessary to update the goals of the plan that are linked to the Nagoya Protocol to include the free, prior and informed consent of indigenous peoples and local communities, and community protocols. Some participants further suggested the extension of Target 16 to include the Cartagena Protocol.

28. Some participants suggested that the Secretariat could invite other conventions to send written submissions that synthesize the vision, scope and cross-cutting issues that their Parties believe could be addressed by the post-2020 global biodiversity framework, taking into account that most of the Parties to the Convention are Parties to the other Rio conventions and other agreements related to biodiversity.

4. *Other relevant processes/Sustainable Development Goals*

29. Regarding the relationship of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework with other global processes, there was agreement that the Secretariat should position biodiversity as a means to achieving the 2030 Agenda and the Sustainable Development Goals and that the post-2020 framework should be aligned with this Agenda.

30. The Convention on Biological Diversity was viewed as having the potential to bring together all the biodiversity-related conventions. It was suggested that a quick analysis of synergies and objectives could be performed to present to Parties.

31. Some participants warned that the scope and nature of the Convention on Biological Diversity should not be confused with the 2030 Agenda, as the Convention is a legally binding agreement and the latter is a set of aspirational and voluntary goals without any financial obligation for their implementation.

5. *Mainstreaming*

32. Participants discussed that the meaning of mainstreaming and how it is to be achieved needs to be clarified, as there are many interpretations and different uses of the term. There was a general agreement that mainstreaming is key to reducing the loss of biodiversity and ecosystem services and should be one of the centrepieces of the new global framework. The need for high-level political leadership was noted. Some mentioned the possibility of high-level targets (or goals), indicators, or process milestones on mainstreaming in the post-2020 framework, and there was agreement that guides, tools, etc. can be provided at the global level to orient national action. There was also the view, however, that mainstreaming should take place at the national level, and that any mainstreaming targets should be made and monitored at the national level.

33. Some participants highlighted the need for national sectoral plans. Others stated that there should be integrated planning at the national level whereby social, environmental and financial plans are not separate government plans with no regard for each other. Inter-institutional agreements giving different ministries and government bodies specific roles could be helpful, as could be conducting the NBSAP revision as a consultative process including sectoral actors.

34. The importance of working with ministries of finance and inserting biodiversity into the economic agenda was highlighted, as was the need to speak their language to communicate the cost of not investing

in biodiversity. Regarding how to make biodiversity issues more attractive to decision makers, some suggested that presenting biodiversity as a contributor to food security could be helpful.

35. There was an acknowledgement of the need to work more closely with the productive sectors. Many believed mainstreaming targets and indicators should be specific to sectors and that there need to be specific strategies that speak to their world and their work. The importance of communicating the impacts of production practices on biodiversity and ecosystem functions on the long-term sustainability of sectors, and on human well-being was emphasized. There was a call for awareness-raising and capacity development for sectoral actors as, in many cases, they are not aware of how they need to change.

36. Mainstreaming in private sector is also a necessity to enhance ownership and contributions from enterprises and to generate impact on production patterns.

37. The need to have a mechanism to consult other government agencies on the post-2020 framework to ensure they are all included was noted. It was also acknowledged that sectors must participate in the construction and negotiation of the framework.

38. It was suggested that, in addition to productive sectors, it is important to mainstreaming biodiversity into the justice sector and to link it with already existing rights to environment, to water and to a healthy environment.

6. *Resource mobilization*

39. Participants were in general agreement that more innovative sources of funds were needed for the post-2020 global biodiversity framework, such as obtaining contributions/taxes from various sectors including financial and private or utilizing other non-monetary mechanisms. Another recommendation was to review existing environmental fiscal matrices to mobilize resources, especially from the private sector. Subsidy reform, and Aichi Biodiversity Target 3 were discussed as promising ways of redirecting funds, particularly in this region where such action could also help to reduce inequalities. Transparency about the origin of funds, the need to avoid greenwashing in the case of industry donations, and the importance of equitable distribution of funds to local governments and communities were emphasized. Common but differentiated responsibilities among Parties was also mentioned on several occasions, highlighting the fact that developed countries have a specific commitment regarding resource mobilization according to Article 20 of the Convention. A proposal was raised for Parties to commit 1 per cent of GDP for investment in biodiversity, which raised much debate and explicit rejection from some Parties. Several countries shared their experiences with national green funds.

40. Participants were in general agreement that resource mobilization should be a specific goal under the post-2020 framework but cautioned that it was necessary to be creative regarding Aichi Biodiversity Target 20 and its potential successor and not fall into the trap of just requesting more funds. Others reminded participants of the various processes already undertaken under Article 20 and Aichi Biodiversity Target 20, including the High-Level Panel on the Global Assessment of Resources for Implementing the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020. Some added that there should be a minimum commitment established for all Parties. Others brought up Article 20 of the Convention and the differentiated responsibilities.

41. There is a need to improve the funding and project management under the Global Environment Facility (GEF) in order to achieve stronger alliance with financial and private sectors, develop reasonable fund disbursement guidelines across project timelines, strengthen capacities, increase impacts, and promote sustainability of results. It was recommended that GEF funding also go to sectors, rather than mostly to environment ministries, in order to help with mainstreaming biodiversity in those sectors. Participants highlighted the importance of national priorities determining funding requests (including those coming through the implementing agencies to GEF). It was also recommended that funding agencies take a broader view of the topics and commitments under the Convention in order to allow countries that have different visions (of adaptation, or development for example) to access funds to implement the Convention. Many

participants noted that an important portion of GEF and other funding goes to planning and that there should be separate funds for implementation of NBSAPs.

42. While it is recognized that biodiversity contributes to climate change adaptation and mitigation, participants highlighted that projects funded to mitigate climate change tend not to incorporate biodiversity conservation and instead exacerbate the problem. It was suggested that the access to and programming under the Green Climate Fund be re-evaluated to ensure a contribution to biodiversity and nature-based solutions.

43. Indigenous peoples stated that, in many cases, they did not benefit significantly from projects that were supposed to assist them due to inaccessibility of funds and inadequate governance. They reminded participants of the need to observe safeguards and to consult and obtain free, prior and informed consent in cases where indigenous peoples and territories are affected. There was some concern as to the effects of funding mechanisms, including Reducing Emissions from Deforestation and Degradation (REDD) and access and benefit-sharing, on the relationships among indigenous groups, and it was recommended that any new funding mechanisms be cautious of the consequences on the well-being of indigenous groups. Participants also highlighted the non-monetary contribution of indigenous peoples to biodiversity, which often goes unrecognized.

44. It was also recommended that funding mechanisms be easier to access as sometimes the requirements prevent subnational and local governments from obtaining funding.

7. *Voluntary commitments*

45. It was also noted that, while voluntary contributions should not replace commitments signed by Parties, they should be binding and should have clear objectives. However, as there were no indicators or reports on voluntary contributions, participation and accountability is low. It was agreed that the post-2020 framework should allow different sectors to report their individual voluntary contributions.

46. Some participants highlighted what they saw as a contradiction in the pressing need to increase ambition to stop and reverse the loss of biodiversity and ecosystem services while discussing voluntary commitments. They believed voluntary commitments should be binding, should be ratcheted up, and should include the principle of non-regression. Some Parties affirmed that it was not possible to speak about voluntary contributions without discussing common but differentiated responsibilities among Parties. It was also suggested that voluntary contributions be accepted from actors other than Governments, and that these should be integrated into the country's NBSAP and counted as national contributions where relevant.

47. Some Parties raised concerns about the indistinctive use of terminology regarding voluntary commitments and voluntary contributions. Some stated that, whatever the figure, these commitments should not replace NBSAP as the main tool for the implementation of the framework and they should be presented as additional inputs for the implementation of the framework, beyond the minimum compromises agreed by all Parties in the framework itself.

48. It was noted that there should be a clear definition of what countries should understand regarding voluntary commitments.

8. *Communication*

49. With regard to communication, there was agreement that transformational change will require messaging that empowers all groups to effect change. The 2050 Vision of "Living in Harmony with Nature" was seen as adequate and easy to relate to for most people. One suggestion for the post-2020 framework was to have a specific goal for CEPA as in the current Strategic Plan for Biodiversity. There was also a suggestion to have a behavioural change impact indicator.

50. The need to engage professional communicators was discussed, in recognition of the fact that many scientists are trying to play the role of communicator but do not have the required skill sets or knowledge to do it effectively. There is also a need for "translation" of the Convention and biodiversity

into lay peoples' terms and languages (including "translation" of key concepts for key sectors so that they can easily see the benefits of biodiversity, and what they can do concretely). This also included focus groups for media to have coherent messages about biodiversity and how it is linked to other major societal challenges, such as climate change, desertification, chemicals and plastics.

51. There was some questioning among participants as to whose role it is to communicate biodiversity. There was agreement that this is primarily a national level task but that more support from the Secretariat could be useful, particularly with materials that could be adapted at the local level, and in helping steer high-level messages.

52. Some countries requested communication documents and official reports to be available in Spanish, in order to reach all actors at all levels of the society, especially in the Latin American and Caribbean region.

9. *Capacity-building*

53. While many efforts have been dedicated to capacity-building under the current Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020, major limitations still exist in this area. Among these, the time required to fundraise for capacity-building, the limited human resources and the frequent employee turnover in government institutions were highlighted. It was suggested that financing for capacity development should span a longer term so that capacity development processes can be supported. Partnerships could be helpful in securing funds.

54. With regard to the contents of capacity development programmes, it was suggested that mechanisms are needed at the country level to determine specific capacity development needs, including subject matters and target groups. It was suggested that, although the post-2020 biodiversity framework will be global, capacity development should reflect regional and local realities and consider what has already been done at the national level. More emphasis should be placed on exchanging experiences and generating and adapting solutions from local experiences. Still others would like to see more opportunities for technical training and degree programmes in certain areas.

55. Some stated that programmes should address the three objectives of the Convention and the two protocols and should focus on implementation of the Convention and the Aichi Targets. Others stated that capacity development should include modules on other multilateral processes relating to biodiversity (such as the Sustainable Development Goals) so that synergies can be strengthened. Various participants advocated for capacity-building on ecosystem-based approaches and biodiverse production systems to restore ecological functions. There was a view that capacity development should have a holistic vision and not be limited to technical issues. It was suggested that a human rights and gender perspective could be helpful, as could one from the social sciences and other areas.

56. With regard to target groups, some participants expressed concern that, generally, very few individuals, usually government technicians, are trained in the Convention on Biological Diversity and its Protocols, generating a vicious cycle of knowledge remaining among few. They suggested there should be a "constructive spiral" to spread the knowledge more broadly to all levels of government, non-governmental organizations and the private sector. It was agreed that there should be a more consistent effort to develop capacities at the primary and secondary school levels. Some were of the view that the actors responsible for causing the loss of biodiversity should be targeted so that there could be an impact on the drivers more directly. One idea was the creation of new technical curricula in sustainable management to be offered to sectoral actors (fishing, agriculture) in order to help them integrate biodiversity in their work.

57. With regard to modalities for capacity-building, it was agreed that capacity development should be tailored to the topic and to the social and ecological context being addressed, preferably maintaining a regional perspective. Workshops are not always the most effective modality and should be complemented by training of trainers, peer-to-peer learning, and the use of information and communication technologies which facilitate reaching more people. It was also suggested that capacity development should not rely

exclusively on best practices, which are often context-specific. It was suggested that contents of the Biodiversity Learning Platform should be extended and enhanced.

58. With regard to indigenous and local knowledge, there was a view that the Convention should go beyond a superficial knowledge and understanding of their potential contributions to truly respect and use these knowledges to fill gaps in scientific knowledge. The importance of incorporating traditional knowledge and scientific knowledge in the context of the Nagoya Protocol was stressed.

10. Technical and scientific cooperation

59. There was significant interest in technical and scientific cooperation, government to government, to learn from others' experiences and have shared capacities across the region. The financial and private sectors were also seen as playing an important role, and it was suggested that more partnerships should be promoted between them and governments, academia and civil society.

60. Technology and innovation, while potentially useful, should be explored with precaution against the risks and uncertainties concerning biodiversity. As there are still many knowledge gaps, one group suggested that "responsible innovation" is needed. Some suggested that governments should provide incentives for sustainable technologies and could convene actors with different skills, perspectives and knowledge areas to work together to innovate.

61. With regard to technology transfer, participants were aware that mechanisms already existed under the Convention, such as the Biobridge Initiative, and were of the opinion that there was a need for a flexible framework for technology transfer that would help transference from one country to another.

62. It was stated that innovation under the Convention should not only refer to technology but also to social innovation – how people organize, types of governance, conflict resolution, etc. It was also argued that innovation should not only be about new technologies and practices but also about traditional practices and knowledges being applied to new contexts.

63. With regard to research, it was agreed that there should be better cooperation with academia so that research can better address the scientific needs related to implementing the Convention. Some concern was expressed over science and knowledge generated in higher-income countries used to solve problems in the region. There is a need to strengthen research and publication of results in Latin America for the region. Some argued that national public research institutions, as well as decision makers, should be strengthened and better linked to IPBES, and that more dialogue with IPBES would be valuable. There was also a view that there is a role for IPBES in building capacities for national reporting and research.

64. An area in which participants thought there was significant room for improvement is in the science-policy interface. Various dimensions were discussed. One of these was the need to "translate" scientific language for different audiences, including policymakers, and implementers. It was suggested that the media could be helpful in this respect. However, it was noted that there is a danger in "losing the facts in the sensation" if it is left only to media to communicate.

65. There was substantial discussion on access to data and information and it was suggested that the Convention's clearing-house mechanism, or another such tool, could be used by countries to access data and information that is produced by third parties in standardized formats. This could be a way to fill knowledge gaps and to know what data already exists. It was suggested that there was a need to fund the organization of information that could be shared in Spanish among countries with financial and cultural similarities.

66. Some participants suggested that there should be a goal or target in the post 2020 framework addressing capacity-building. This could be as part of a broader goal on enabling conditions which could be a major pillar of the new framework. It was also suggested that the short-term action plan to enhance and support capacity-building should be carried forward and adjusted to the new global biodiversity framework.

11. Knowledge management and the clearing-house mechanism

67. Participants noted the importance of using and publicizing existing biodiversity data protocols and interchange as a foundation for sharing biodiversity data. It was noted that it can be difficult to compel Parties and other actors to share data in an open and accessible manner. In addition, it was observed that there should be a strengthening of the interaction between academia and the public sector. The importance of contributions from civil society and indigenous peoples and local communities to the collection of data and knowledge was also noted. Many participants mentioned the importance of improving the clearing-house mechanism and the CBD website to improve access to information and data, both for the general public (in a less “technical” form) and for practitioners. The sheer volume and variety of available data can be a burden for those needing to use it to create policy. Participants suggested that the Secretariat could work with partners to synergize and publicize data resources. Many participants also emphasized the importance of capacity-building to provide additional skills at the national and subnational levels for data collection and utilization.

12. Integrating diverse perspectives

68. There was consensus on the importance of including diverse perspectives at all levels of decision-making – from policy design, negotiation, implementation, to monitoring, reporting and evaluation. The wide range of interests, vulnerabilities and opportunities of different groups, such as non-governmental organizations, indigenous peoples and local communities, women, youth, academia, private sector, and subnational governments, were acknowledged, as was the importance of clarifying roles, rights and responsibilities for different groups under the post-2020 global biodiversity framework. Specifically, it was highlighted that non-governmental organizations may not accurately represent the whole civil society and that there was a need to clarify their roles and interests. Similarly, the difference between stakeholders and rights-holders was emphasized.

69. Several challenges for the integration of diverse perspectives were identified, including limited resources for people to attend national and international consultations, remoteness of indigenous peoples and local communities, the time requirement for engagement with no guaranteed returns, and political sensitivities on the part of governments regarding engagement of different groups in a party-driven process such as the Convention on Biological Diversity. Other challenges included language barriers, inadequate communication channels, mistrust between actors and lack of continuity. The importance of increased capacity of self-organization, planning, budgeting and resource mobilization for stakeholder groups to promote their own engagement was recognized as was the need to educate and raise peoples’ awareness and understanding of the importance of inclusive participation. It was also suggested that engagement processes should to be driven by local priorities rather than by international pressures.

70. Participants highlighted the importance of integrating in the post 2020 framework different decisions relating to fundamental socio-cultural and human rights (indigenous people, women, youth, Mother Earth) already recognized at the international level under CBD, UNEA or other UN System processes, which are not currently implemented at the national and/or local levels. It was suggested that the new global framework could integrate principles and indicators of participation and inclusion in all its targets. Awareness and education indicators could also be helpful. NBSAPs and national reports could provide clear guidance for participation and could evaluate and report on engagement. Developing reporting tools and using specific and measurable indicators for specific groups and their engagement was highlighted to be important to ensure inclusive and equal participation of different groups.

71. The Nagoya Protocol was mentioned various times as being very important for the engagement of different groups, particularly women, and for the transfer of benefits.

13. Gender considerations

72. Participants expressed the importance of training Parties and others on gender perspectives and their relationship with biodiversity. They also highlighted the need to clarify that “women” are not a

homogenous category but a diverse subset of the population. It is important to specifically identify different groups' contributions to biodiversity and the differential impacts on them from its loss.

73. There was a view that the gender perspective should be explicit in the post-2020 global biodiversity framework. It was suggested that specific and measurable indicators should be incorporated in order to monitor the inclusion of women and girls in the governance and use of biodiversity. A specific target with the support of different Parties was suggested: "By the year 2030, ensure that women and girls are an active part of decision-making, management and custody of biodiversity and they equally benefit from it and its ecosystem services". Some participants recommended that an explicit mandate be established to include a gender perspective and its reporting in the national strategies. There were also suggestions for a training plan to be established to facilitate the work of the Parties, including training on gender-responsive planning and gender-sensitive budgets.

14. National biodiversity strategies and action plans

74. As many countries have only recently finalized the revision of their NBSAPs in line with the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020 and the Aichi Targets, there was a consensus that these NBSAPs should continue to be the basis for implementation in the coming years, with adjustments as necessary considering the post 2020 global framework. In this light, many considered that there should be some consistency and coherence between the Aichi Targets and the targets in the new global framework. However, it was agreed that, as the new framework has yet to be developed, it is too soon to know if existing NBSAPs will need to be adjusted and, if so, to what extent. It was noted that, considering the need for "transformational change" and "out-of-the-box" thinking, there may also be a need for substantial changes in the existing NBSAPs in order to achieve this.

75. With regard to the time frame of NBSAPs, it was proposed that strategies be devised for the longer term – more than five years – with established funding so that there would be a more consistent commitment even if political priorities change with changes in governments.

76. Some participants mentioned that, while many countries included indigenous peoples and local communities, women, the private sector and civil society groups in NBSAP revision processes, it is also important to involve them in their implementation. Others indicated that subnational governments should be given implementation responsibilities. Various groups mentioned the need to involve scientists more and to use automatic and digital measuring systems to obtain data.

77. With regard to national commitments, it was suggested that voluntary commitments by countries should become obligatory once they are in the national biodiversity strategy. Some participants thought that countries should indicate, in quantifiable form, what they can commit to under each of the new targets, and these commitments should be obligatory.

78. Some thought that there should be a standard format for NBSAPs and/or that there should be standardized and comparable indicators under the new framework so that countries can measure implementation in the same way. Some suggested that these indicators should be verifiable by the Secretariat.

79. Some Parties referred to the complexity of NBSAPs and their lack of use for effective communication about Parties specific priorities and challenges regarding biodiversity. Some Parties have developed plans of action for the implementation of their NBSAPs. These plans of action identify a set of milestones and goals in the short term that could be useful for evaluation of progress, communication, international cooperation and application of ratcheted mechanism.

80. Some countries added that the possibility could be explored for voluntary commitments to take the form of the nationally determined contributions of the Paris Agreement. This would imply that Parties can report their contributions without conditioning, and such nationally determined contributions could be incorporated into the NBSAPs.

15. *Review mechanisms*

81. With respect to mechanisms for review of implementation, there was some agreement that more could be done. A broad range of views was expressed. Some suggested that there should be intermediary reports in between the obligatory national reports, external evaluations (perhaps by civil society) in parallel to national reports, a compliance committee for the Convention, or a ranking system that would give points to countries for each global target achieved nationally. For the latter, it was suggested that the different circumstances of countries, including their vulnerability to such catastrophes as hurricanes, could be taken into consideration in the ranking. Several participants expressed their differences regarding external evaluations and the points system, arguing that they would contradict the text and spirit of the Convention.

82. Some stated that there is a need to adapt the presentation of national reports to a more efficient, objective and quantifiable format, considering the final post-2020 framework and the potential adjustments to NBSAPs.

III. PROCEEDINGS OF THE CONSULTATION

A. Opening of the Consultation and organizational matters

83. The Consultation was opened on 14 May 2019 by the Minister of Housing, Territorial Planning and Environment of Uruguay, Ms Eneida de León, followed by the National Director of Environment for the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Ambassador Fernando Marr. In her remarks, Ms. de Leon welcomed the participants to Uruguay and highlighted her country's commitment to the transformational change necessary to conserve biodiversity and maintain ecosystem functions, and their commitment to be a part of the strengthening of Latin America and the Caribbean as one of the most biodiverse regions on the planet, and one that produces the most food for the world. She mentioned that one of greatest challenges for Uruguay lay in articulating agricultural development with biodiversity protection on 90 per cent of its lands, which are apt for production and are privately owned. She noted that Uruguay was implementing a project that integrated biodiversity, land degradation and climate change and that the lessons from that project could be helpful for the post-2020 process.

84. Mr. Marr highlighted the fact that the Convention on Biological Diversity constituted the first official recognition that biodiversity conservation is in the interest of all humanity. He noted that ecosystem services are fundamental for sustainable development and human well-being, and that their degradation and loss hindered world development, affected food security and nutrition, water supply and access, and human health. This showed the importance of biodiversity conservation and of the connectivity and resilience of ecosystems. He mentioned that Uruguay had ratified the Convention in 1993 and had also signed and ratified the Cartagena and Nagoya Protocols. He added that, over the preceding few years, biodiversity had been a priority for the country which has launched its revised NBSAP in 2016 and promulgated the national law on biodiversity conservation and sustainable use. Uruguay has many of the main drivers of biodiversity loss as the rest of the world which makes it important to continue working in this area.

85. The Executive Secretary of the Convention on Biological Diversity, Ms. Cristiana Pasca Palmer, delivered a video message to welcome the participants to the consultation.²

86. Following the opening remarks, the Co-Chairs of the Open-ended Working Group on the Post-2020 Global Biodiversity Framework, Mr. Francis Ogwal (Uganda) and Mr. Basile van Havre (Canada), provided an overview of the process for developing the post-2020 global biodiversity framework. They explained the contents of decision 14/34 and confirmed their commitment to ensuring that the post-2020 process adhered to the principles enshrined in the decision. They noted that the process for developing the post-2020 global biodiversity framework would have three "phases": one to collect views from the regions through consultations; one to undertake thematic consultations; and one to bring

² See <https://youtu.be/8sk2tA6ua8o>

those two elements together so that they could be considered by the Working Group. In concluding, they noted that the purpose of the regional consultations was not about coming to agreed conclusions but rather to identify issues and to begin exchanging views.³

87. Following the Co-Chair's presentation, Ms. Jyoti Mathur-Filipp, Director of the Implementation Support Division of the Secretariat, invited participants to observe a minute of silence for Ms. Alejandra Barrios Perez, member of the Mexican delegation, who had passed away the week before the Consultation.

88. Participants elected Ms. Helena Jeffrey Brown (Antigua and Barbuda) and Ms. Elisa Dalgalarondo (Uruguay) to serve as co-chairs for the meeting, and Mr. Hesiquio Benitez (Mexico) as rapporteur. Ms. Maria Nube Szepeghyi (Uruguay) served as the facilitator for the Consultation.

89. Ms Nadine Saad (Secretariat) provided an overview of the agenda for the consultation. Participants then introduced themselves.

B. Current state of affairs and future trends

90. This session addressed the current and future trends of biodiversity. Ms. Maria Elena Zaccagnini (IPBES) provided an overview of the *Regional Assessment Report on Biodiversity and Ecosystem Services for Americas* undertaken by the Intergovernmental Science-Policy Platform on Biodiversity and Ecosystem Services (IPBES).⁴ Ms. Hivy Ortiz Chour (FAO) gave a presentation on the *State of the World's Biodiversity for Food and Agriculture*.⁵

91. Mr. Bernardo Strassburg presented the recently adopted *Global Assessment Report on Biodiversity and Ecosystem Services* of IPBES.⁶ Mr. Strassburg presented a tool for identifying priority areas for restoration and to quantify their impacts.⁷

92. Following the presentations, participants formed discussion groups to reflect on the opportunities and challenges for the region in attaining "sustainability" and "living in harmony with nature" as well as on how the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020 enabled (or not) national implementation action. Following the group discussions, each group provided a report to the plenary.

93. Several international organizations that support Parties in implementing the Convention on Biological Diversity and the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity then participated in a panel discussion on the opportunities, challenges and insights from their work relevant to the development of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework. The members of the panel were Ms. Hivy Ortiz Chour (FAO), Ms. Stephanie Arellano (IUCN), Ms. Alexandra Fischer (United Nations Development Programme), Mr. Mark Zimsky (Global Environment Fund), Mr. Giovanni Ruta, (World Bank), Ms. Alexandra Moreira (Amazon Cooperation Treaty Organization), and Mr. Jose Dallo (United Nations Environment Programme). The panellists then answered questions from participants.

³ The Co-Chairs' presentation is accessible from https://www.cbd.int/doc/c/2fe4/586f/a181a0949ca8dbcd1e046bb/post2020-ws-2019-05-presentation-cochairs1_post2020-reg-consult-grulac-intro-v7-en.pdf

⁴ The presentation is accessible from https://www.cbd.int/doc/c/bb45/8cd0/ea1dc7f7fc9c6d2a5471a435/post2020-ws-2019-05-presentation-elena_zaccagnini_ipbes_americas-assessment-spanish-montevideo-mez-en.pdf. The full report is also available at: https://www.cbd.int/doc/c/be65/6dcb/633cb5b1afb37d03a1a064bf/post2020-ws-2019-05-presentation-2018_americas_full_report_book_v5_pages_0-en.pdf

⁵ The presentation is accessible from https://www.cbd.int/doc/c/039c/229f/0e2eaab9ac9612b875f40cc0/post2020-ws-2019-05-presentation-hivy_ortiz_fao_biodiversidad-montevideo-en.pdf

⁶ <https://www.cbd.int/doc/c/29d8/41fb/65dfb0dcc20f634eb1e2169e/post2020-ws-2019-05-presentation-strassburg-ipbes-ga-for-cbd-grulac-en.pdf>

⁷ <https://www.cbd.int/doc/c/0875/a2e2/2495526c5663460fad090f27/post2020-ws-2019-05-presentation-strassburg-restoration-for-cbd-grulac-may19-en.pdf>

C. Shaping and communicating new narratives for biodiversity

94. During this session, Ms. Margaret Egbula (Secretariat) made a presentation on communication for the post-2020 biodiversity framework.⁸ She noted that the development of a communications strategy for the post-2020 process was under way, focusing on the directive contained in decision 14/34 of the Conference of the Parties, to deliver a strategy that would be coherent, comprehensive and innovative. The tools to put the strategy into action included: new narratives about biodiversity; partnerships; key dates and events; and communications products and materials. Innovation in that context meant testing new technologies and platforms but also new approaches and messages. The Action Agenda for Nature and People would feature heavily in communications going forward, with the aim of reaching new audiences and building public support for the post-2020 framework. Following the presentation, the presenter took questions from the participants that suggested, among other things, partnerships with organizations with key influence in social networks, broader covering and diffusion of the meetings related to the post-2020 process and the engagement of champions with global and high-level recognition.

D. Developing the post-2020 framework

Introduction of the discussion paper on the post-2020 global biodiversity framework

95. During this session, the Co-Chairs of the Open-ended Working Group introduced the discussion paper on the post-2020 global biodiversity framework.⁹ They gave a snapshot of the submissions received on the scope and content of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework and introduced a series of questions to facilitate further discussions. They clarified that the questions were not intended to limit or prejudge the outcomes of the process for developing the post-2020 global biodiversity framework.

Visioning the world we want in 2050: thinking out of the box

96. During this session, Ms. Jyoti Mathur-Filipp (Secretariat) made a presentation on transition management.¹⁰ Following the presentation, participants separated into discussion groups to identify concrete actions to help bend the curve of biodiversity loss by 2030 and foster transformative change. They were challenged to “think out of the box” during their discussions. Following the group discussions, participants, using a dominoes game exercise, jointly developed a set of interlinked actions and possible pathways towards realizing the 2050 Vision of “living in harmony with nature”.

Integrating diverse perspectives

97. During this session, several participants representing observer organizations provided their views on the possible scope and elements of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework. Presentations were made by Mr. Gadir Lavadenz (CBD Alliance) and Ms. Ana di Pangracion (Fundación Ambiente y Recursos Naturales)¹¹, Ms. Amelia Arreguin (Eco Maxei representing Gender)¹², Ms. Melina Sakiyama (Global Youth Biodiversity Network),¹³ Mr. Rodrigo Perpetuo (ICLEI – Local Governments for Sustainability)¹⁴

⁸https://www.cbd.int/doc/c/b4de/6594/044f4fbcf3405a66cf695cfb/post2020-ws-2019-05-presentation-margaret_cbd_new-narratives-for-biodiversity-grulac-consultation-en.pdf

⁹https://www.cbd.int/doc/c/2dc4/86c1/8be08731feaa5f0ff8c45f6d/post2020-ws-2019-05-presentation-cochairs9_45post2020-reg-consult-grulac-disc-ppr-v7-en.pdf

¹⁰ The presentation is accessible from https://www.cbd.int/doc/c/1f23/d65b/1a11dd4700ee37f53c82a294/post2020-ws-2019-05-presentation-transitions_cbd_grulac-2020---jyoti-en.pdf

¹¹ The presentation is accessible from https://www.cbd.int/doc/c/a90f/e1c3/231f64534bfb5a51c179690/post2020-ws-2019-05-presentation-cbd_alliance_gadir-y-ana-nal-montevideo-mayo-2019-es.pdf

¹² The presentation is accessible from https://www.cbd.int/doc/c/8add/a0e0/9103dfbb0fd4ebdb7e8e4777/post2020-ws-2019-05-presentation-amelia_gender-for-the-post2020-lac-en.pdf

¹³ The presentation is accessible from https://www.cbd.int/doc/c/c035/c377/a00ead82713824d9e7a1a5bd/post2020-ws-2019-05-presentation-melina_lac_post-2020_gybn_ms2-en.pdf

¹⁴ The presentation is accessible from https://www.cbd.int/doc/c/8614/6fe0/e04f42ec096c3e108c3bfcdb/post2020-ws-2019-05-presentation-iclei_grulac---r_perpetuo-en.pdf

Ms. Yolanda Terán (Andes Chinchansuyo, Ecuador),¹⁶ Mr. Tony James (South Rupununi District Council, Guyana)¹⁷, Mr. Héctor Soria (AVAAZ)¹⁵ and Mr. Robson Capretz (Boticario Group Foundation) and Ms Renata Camargo (Sugar Cane Industry Union (UNICA)).¹⁶ Following the presentations, presenters responded to questions from participants.

Possible elements of the post-2020 framework

98. During this session, participants separated into groups to consider issues related to the scope and content of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework. The issues were grouped and discussed under the following six stations using a world café format:

- (a) Structure of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework, integration of the protocols, and biodiversity targets, including from other relevant processes;
- (b) Mainstreaming of biodiversity into relevant sectors and across society, and communication;
- (c) Resource mobilization and voluntary commitments and contributions;
- (d) Capacity-building, technical and scientific cooperation and knowledge management;
- (e) Integrating diverse perspectives and gender considerations;
- (f) Implementation and NBSAPs, new mechanisms for accountability and review processes.

99. Each group visited all six stations, and facilitators of the stations synthesized the discussions and reported back to the plenary.

100. During the plenary discussion, participants were asked to identify any issues that required further consideration so that they could be taken up on the following day. Several Parties indicated that they wanted some time to exchange their views and the content of their submissions within the framework of the meeting. However, that was not a consensus view among participants, so it was agreed that interested Party representatives could meet immediately after the closure of the Consultation on the next day. Participants noted on cards the issues that they would like to address on the following day, and it was decided that there would be a final plenary discussion before the closure. Plenary discussion focused on voluntary commitments, NBSAPs and resource mobilization.

E. Wrap-up and closure of the Consultation

101. During this session, Ms Carolina Neme presented a project on synergies among Rio conventions being implemented in Uruguay.¹⁷

102. Following that presentation, participants discussed the issue of national voluntary commitments and their relationship with NBSAPs, as well as resource mobilization.

103. In closing the Consultation, the Co-Chairs of the Open-ended Working Group reflected on the outcomes of the Consultation and outlined the next steps and expectations in the process for developing the post-2020 global biodiversity framework. That was followed by remarks from National Director of Environment for the Ministry of Housing, Territorial Planning and Environment of Uruguay (MVOTMA), Mr Alejandro Nario.

¹⁶ The presentation is accessible from https://www.cbd.int/doc/c/a7e7/fe7d/ff4f7bab768259c7cccbe14/post2020-ws-2019-05-presentation-yolanda_perspectivas-sobre-biodiversidad-en.pdf

¹⁵ The presentation is accessible from <https://www.cbd.int/doc/c/3cc0/6456/7c9ba19db18a7c42bfb3a241/post2020-ws-2019-05-presentation-avaaz---cbd-regional-meeting---montevideo-en.pdf>

¹⁶ <https://www.cbd.int/doc/c/786e/3291/dd0e7a0516516551eba580ed/post2020-ws-2019-05-presentation-unica--cdb---resumida-en.pdf>

¹⁷ <https://www.cbd.int/doc/c/8527/eedc/8ec7caf7ec1cc0bf9a012951/post2020-ws-2019-05-presentation-presentacion-proyecto-sinergias-uruguay-es.pdf>

