



Convention on Biological Diversity

Distr.
LIMITED

CBD/WG2020/2/L.1
24 February 2020

ORIGINAL: ENGLISH

OPEN-ENDED WORKING GROUP
ON THE POST-2020 GLOBAL
BIODIVERSITY

Second meeting
Rome, 24-29 February 2020

DRAFT REPORT

INTRODUCTION

1. The second meeting of the Open-ended Working Group on the Post-2020 Global Biodiversity Framework was held at the headquarters of the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO) in Rome from 24 to 29 February 2020.

Attendance

2. The meeting was attended by representatives of the following Parties and other Governments: [to be completed].
3. Observers from the following United Nations bodies, specialized agencies, convention secretariats and other bodies also attended: [to be completed]
4. The following organizations were also represented as observers: [to be completed].

ITEM 1. OPENING OF THE MEETING

5. The meeting was opened at 10:15 on 24 February 2020 by Mr. Basil van Havre on behalf of himself and Mr. Francis Ogwal, Co-Chairs of the Working Group.

6. An opening statement was made by Mr. Qu Dongyu, Director-General of FAO, who said that the Convention on Biological Diversity, in protecting global biodiversity, enhanced the sustainability of agriculture, forestry and fisheries in the fight against hunger and malnutrition. The 2030 Agenda challenged countries to eliminate all forms of malnutrition by ensuring that sufficient quantities of safe, nutritious, affordable food were available to everyone, while creating growth and employment opportunities to eradicate poverty, avoiding biodiversity loss and overexploitation of natural resources and adapting to climate change. All actors must work together to bring about the necessary radical changes. Advantage should be taken of digitalization to accelerate transformation of food systems, including in farming and rural development. He asked that participants keep in mind the important role of FAO in implementing the post-2020 biodiversity framework through its four functional services: data collection and information dissemination; standard-setting and multilateral policy; consultation on policy; and capacity-building.

7. Mr. Hamdallah Zedan, speaking on behalf of the President of the Conference of the Parties, Ms. Yasmine Fouad, expressed his appreciation for the work of all concerned in rapidly relocating the meeting. The importance of the post-2020 framework for reducing the rate of biodiversity loss could not be overstated. Although the Conference of the Parties had taken steps to translate the general provisions of the Convention into practical action, it would be important to learn from the barriers, which included lack of political will and support to implement the Convention, limited financial resources, limited public and stakeholder involvement and limited mainstreaming and integration of biodiversity issues into other sectors. The world now needed more innovative, transformative solutions with tangible, positive impacts. The new framework and the proposed goals and targets would be negotiated at the

present meeting. At the same time, Parties should continue to accelerate implementation of the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011–2020 and the Aichi Biodiversity Targets to ensure a seamless transition to the new framework. Ambition was necessary not only in setting goals and targets but also in providing the financial and other means to achieve them and mechanisms to review progress and hold each other accountable. The framework must be balanced and useful for all Parties. It must highlight the potential of nature- and ecosystem-based solutions in which biodiversity could contribute to climate change mitigation and adaptation, to combating desertification and degraded land restoration, to food security and to health and well-being. The Presidency of the Conference of the Parties would advance the Sharm el Sheikh to Kunming Action Agenda for Nature and People and promote a coherent approach to addressing biodiversity loss, climate change and land and ecosystem degradation.

8. A statement was made by the Deputy Permanent Representative of China to FAO/UNEP, Mr. Xia Yingxian, on behalf of the incoming Presidency of the Conference of the Parties. He said that his country shared the vision of living in harmony with nature as the future of life on earth, as that was part of its cultural and natural tradition. He looked forward to consensus on targets and goals that were based on scientific studies and also to interlinkage between targets and goals that were specific, measurable, attainable, relevant and time-bound (SMART). The framework should be balanced and transparent, and should include a clear financial action plan.

9. Ms. Elizabeth Maruma Mrema, Acting Executive Secretary, welcomed all participants and thanked the Governments of Austria, Australia, Canada, Finland, France, Germany, New Zealand, Norway, Sweden, Switzerland and the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland and the European Commission for providing financial resources to support participation of representatives of developing countries and countries with economies in transition and of indigenous peoples and local communities. She also thanked FAO for hosting the meeting at short notice and recognized the work of the Government of China. The meeting had more than 1,000 registered participants representing 142 countries and delegates from civil society, indigenous peoples and local communities, business, women, youth and other stakeholders, which would ensure meaningful discussions and advance the three objectives of the Convention. Although the presentIt was a critical time for biodiversity and for the Convention, and the evidence, knowledge and ability were available to address the challenges. The “zero draft” of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework was based on a “theory of change” that would allow diverse stakeholders to work together towards common goals, using the same language and ensuring collective action. It also provided guidance on goals, SMART targets, indicators, baselines and monitoring frameworks for the drivers of biodiversity loss for achieving transformational change. She looked forward to a common understanding of the elements of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework, its scope and its content blocks. The world required demonstrable progress towards a clear, actionable, transformative global framework on biodiversity that could be adapted at national level.

10. Mr. Nazar Al-Dabbagh, Chief Medical Officer, FAO, described basic precautions against all respiratory virus infections.

11. Statements were made by the following regional groups: New Zealand on behalf of Japan, the United States of America, Canada, Australia and New Zealand and also of Iceland, Israel, Monaco, Norway and Switzerland; Croatia on behalf of the European Union and its 27 member States; South Africa on behalf of the African Group; Costa Rica on behalf of the Latin American and Caribbean Group; Kuwait on behalf of the Asia-Pacific region; and Georgia on behalf of Central and Eastern Europe.

12. Statements were also made on behalf of the biodiversity-related conventions, the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change on behalf of the Rio conventions, the International Indigenous Forum on Biodiversity (IIFB), the civil society organizations represented at the meeting, the Global Youth Biodiversity Network (GYBN), the CBD Women’s Caucus, the Business for Nature Coalition, the International Union for Conservation of Nature (IUCN) and the Advisory Committee on Subnational Governments and Biodiversity.

13. At the 3rd plenary session of the meeting, on 25 February 2020, the Co-Chair invited Ambassador Peter Thompson, Special Envoy of the United Nations Secretary-General for the Oceans, to address the meeting.

14. Mr. Thompson said that most life forms on the planet, including humans, were living a climate and environmental emergency, and the zero draft must be sufficient to meet that emergency. He said that there could be no healthy planetary ecosystem without a healthy ocean ecosystem; however, unconscionable levels of pollution and harmful fishing practices continued, and the rates of ocean deoxygenation, acidification and warming were increasing. Without greater human ambition to correct the destruction of the planetary life-support systems, all efforts on behalf of the ocean's health and the planet's biodiversity would come to nought. Everything was connected, and silos must be broken down and work-streams converged to reduce greenhouse gas emissions. Although the zero draft referred to the harvesting of wild species, reports by FAO and the Intergovernmental Science-Policy Platform on Biodiversity and Ecosystem Services showed that sustainable aquaculture, not wild catch, was vital to food security. Ambassador Thompson urged that illegal, unreported and unregulated fishing be made illegal before 2030. He commented that the most important section of the zero draft, on reducing threats to biodiversity, was unclear, and more straightforward, precise statements were required. He called for well-coordinated action by all, with enhanced urgency and ambition and better cohesion among the Sustainable Development Goals.

ITEM 2. ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA AND ORGANIZATION OF WORK

A. Adoption of the agenda

15. At the 1st plenary session of the meeting, on 24 February 2020, the Working Group adopted the following agenda on the basis of the provisional agenda prepared by the Acting Executive Secretary in consultation with the Bureau ([CBD/WG2020/2/1](#)):

1. Opening of the meeting.
2. Organization of work.
3. Progress since the first meeting.
4. Post-2020 global biodiversity framework.
5. Other matters.
6. Adoption of the report.
7. Closing statements.

B. Election of officers

16. At the 1st plenary session of the meeting, on 24 February 2020, the Working Group noted that the Bureau of the Conference of the Parties would serve as the Bureau of the Working Group and agreed that Ms. Leina El-Awadhi (the Bureau member from Kuwait) would act as Rapporteur for the meeting.

C. Organization of work

17. At the 1st plenary session of the meeting, on 24 February 2020, the Working Group considered the organization of work proposed by the Co-Chairs, as set out in annex I to the annotated provisional agenda (CBD/WG2020/2/1/Add.1) and the "scenario note" prepared by the Co-Chairs (CBD/WG2020/2/1/Add.2/Rev.1).

18. Following a presentation by the Co-Chairs on the meeting objectives, proposed organization of work, expected outcome of the meeting and next steps in the post-2020 global biodiversity framework preparatory process, the Working Group adopted the proposed organization of work and decided to establish four contact groups to allow in-depth discussion of the zero draft: (a) contact group 1 on goals for the post-2020 global biodiversity framework; (b) contact group 2 on reducing threats for biodiversity; (c) contact group 3 on meeting the needs of people; and (d) contact group 4 on tools and solutions.

19. At the 4th plenary session of the meeting, on 27 February 2020, the Working Group heard a final report by the co-leads of contact group 1 and interim progress reports by the co-leads of contact groups 2 and 3.

20. At the 5th plenary session of the meeting, on 28 February 2020, the Working Group heard final reports by the co-leads of contact groups 2 and 3 and an interim progress report by the co-lead of contact group 4.

21. At the 6th plenary session of the meeting, on 29 February 2020, the Working Group heard a final report by the co-leads of contact group 4.

Work of the contact groups

22. Contact group 1, co-led by Mr. Vinod Mathur (India) and Ms. Rosemary Paterson (New Zealand), held three meetings on 25 and 26 February 2020.

23. Contact group 2, co-led Ms. Wadzanayi Goredema-Mandivenyi (South Africa) and Ms. Gabriele Obermayr (Austria), held three meetings from 25 to 27 February 2020.

24. Contact group 3, co-led by Ms. Anne Teller (European Union) and Mr. Jorge Murillo (Colombia), held two meetings on 26 and 27 February 2020.

25. Contact group 4, co-led by Ms. Charlotta Sörqvist (Sweden) and Ms. Teona Karchava (Georgia), held two meetings on 28 February 2020.

ITEM 3. PROGRESS SINCE THE FIRST MEETING

26. At the 1st plenary session of the meeting, on 24 February 2020, the Working Group took up agenda item 3. In considering the item, the Working Group had before it a note by the Executive Secretary on the consultations conducted and other contributions received regarding the post-2020 process (CBD/WG2020/2/2).

27. The Co-Chairs noted that, since the first meeting of the Working Group, several consultations and thematic workshops had been held to provide further input to the preparatory process. They invited the co-leads of those consultations and workshops to provide brief summaries of the discussions that had taken place.

28. The Working Group first heard reports from the co-leads of thematic workshops organized by the Secretariat in collaboration with its partners and under the guidance of the Co-Chairs and held since the first meeting of the Working Group.

29. On the topic of ecosystem restoration, Ms. Eugenia Arguedas Montezuma (Costa Rica), speaking also on behalf of her co-lead, Ms. Nicola Breier, provided a summary of the report of a thematic workshop held in Rio de Janeiro, Brazil, 6 to 8 November 2019 (CBD/POST2020/WS/2019/11/5). The main outputs were key messages on the role of ecosystem restoration in the post-2020 global biodiversity framework and the discussion on targets, including draft language. Participants in the workshop had emphasized the urgency of acting immediately while improving enabling conditions to reach global goals and avoid tipping points, and had highlighted the need to set an ambitious, overarching and holistic global target on restoration; to establish smart targets for 2050, 2040 and 2030 that follow as a sequence of restoration; and to set targets that were outcome-oriented, focusing on biodiversity and ecosystem functionality rather than just area and taking into account all ecosystems and synergies within systems, commitments and processes. Regarding linkage to other targets, participants stressed that harmful subsidies should be reoriented towards financing restoration, that ecosystem restoration contributed to all three objectives of the Convention and that restoration was a key driver for transformational change. They noted that ecosystem restoration cut across the three Rio conventions and highlighted the opportunity to use shared indicators. Key messages for implementation included: the process should be fully participatory and inclusive of indigenous peoples and local communities, with emphasis on traditional and indigenous knowledge, gender equity and youth engagement; it was important to distinguish between

initial states and restoration outcomes along the restorative continuum; and effective restoration requires spatial planning, prioritization and large-scale implementation across ecosystems.

30. Speaking on marine and coastal biodiversity, also on behalf of his co-chair, Ms. Ilham Mohammed (Maldives), Mr. Adam van Opzeeland (New Zealand) summarized the outcomes of a workshop held in Montreal, Canada, 13 to 15 November 2019, as contained in the report of the workshop (CBD/POST2020/WS/2019/10/2). The workshop participants had focused on exploitation of marine living resources; marine pollution; important marine ecosystems; ecosystem restoration; area-based planning and conservation; and threatened, endangered and declining species. They had also identified areas that warranted greater attention, including climate change and ocean biodiversity; regional approaches; marine spatial planning; and exploitation of non-living resources. The Working Group was encouraged to consult the workshop report for details on the many views expressed during the workshop, including on targets elements found in the zero draft of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework. Key messages from the workshop were that marine biodiversity challenges are highly complex, with scientific and technical, socio-economic and cultural, political aspects; the marine realm has many unique and separate characteristics to be taken into account, including unexplored areas, high seas, geographic fluidity, land-ocean interface; outcome should be considered first, and then how to achieve it; targets from the previous framework had useful elements and could be improved through measurement, indicators, monitoring and collaboration; and complementarity between targets and among international marine bodies would support successful outcomes. The outputs of the workshop were evident throughout the zero draft of the framework, in several targets. Given the limited number of targets, it was not always possible to have separate marine targets. Nevertheless, sector-specific action could be considered in the “elements for measurement” and subsequent indicators, and it would at times be useful to have specific marine targets.

31. The Working Group resumed its consideration of agenda item 3 at the 2nd plenary session of the meeting, on 24 February 2020, and heard additional reports on the consultations held since the first meeting of the Working Group for the preparation of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework.

32. For area-based conservation measures, Ms. Marie-May Muzungail (Seychelles) provided a summary of a thematic workshop held in La Prairie, Canada, 1–3 December 2019, more fully described in the workshop report (CBD/POST2020/WS/2019/9/3). Participants in the workshop had discussed potential scope and coverage of area-based conservation measures; representativeness, especially areas of importance for biodiversity and ecosystem services; connectivity and the ecosystem approach; effectiveness; equity and good governance; and landscape and seascape approaches, including spatial planning. They had also identified issues requiring further discussion, including resource mobilization; transparency, review and reporting; climate change; and people, including the applications of a rights-based approach. Mr. Stefan Leiner (European Commission) then presented the key messages and outcomes of the workshop, highlighting the success of Aichi Target 11, whose positive aspects should be built on and negative aspects learned from; the relevance of area-based conservation measures across multiple goals/targets of the new framework; the need to understand protected areas and other effective area-based conservation measures in the context of the wider landscape/seascape; and the fact that many of the thematic issues discussed were also relevant across multiple targets of the new framework. In terms of targets, important messages from the workshop were that the new framework should build on Aichi Target 11 but be more ambitious; effectiveness should be determined by outcome; indicators should be adopted at the same time as the targets to allow progress to be measured from the outset; and terms should be clearly defined.

33. For resource mobilization for the post-2020 global biodiversity framework, Ms. Ines Verleye (Belgium) and Ms. Luciana Melchert Saguas Presas (Brazil) reported on the thematic workshop held in Berlin, 14–16 January 2020, outlining the information contained in the workshop report (CBD/POST2020/WS/2019/3/3). Ms. Verleye began by noting that a panel of experts had been convened pursuant to decision 14/22 but had not yet submitted its report, and both the workshop and any discussion at the current meeting were a very preliminary step. There were three main approaches to resource mobilization: reduce the need for resources, particularly by mainstreaming; enhance the use of resources,

for which capacity-building and technology transfer were needed; and provide new resources. The workshop participants had generally agreed that: public sector finance remained the backbone of resource mobilization, with international development very instrumental in leveraging domestic resources; it was important to ensure policy coherence at the national level in general but particularly for climate change and biodiversity financing, deliver resources where they were needed and reform incentives that harmed biodiversity; the impact of poverty should be taken into account in transformational change and a just transition ensured, with access and benefit-sharing considered as a potential source of resource mobilization; more partnerships were needed, with businesses, banks and non-governmental organizations; and discussions on resource mobilization should cover the role of indigenous peoples and local communities. Participants had also agreed on the need to enhance accountability and reporting and incorporate new technologies. Ms. Melchert concluded the presentation, stressing the particular importance of policy coherence and a just transition: strict conservation policies that induced more poverty in developing countries were not recommended, and while it was important to engage the private sector, developing countries had to be able to count on predictable sources of funding from developed countries.

34. A representative of the Secretariat then provided an update on related work being done to implement decision 14/23 on the financial mechanism, in connection with the assessment of funds needed for the eighth replenishment of the Trust Fund of the Global Environment Facility. The Secretariat had contracted a team of three experts, who had developed a questionnaire to collect information from Parties on project that might be envisaged for the eighth replenishment. The questionnaire had been circulated the previous week, and the team was present at the current meeting to provide information and conduct consultations with representatives of Parties. The Secretariat would also provide a briefing during an information session at the current meeting on work being done to assist the Subsidiary Body on Implementation in preparing proposals, pursuant to decision 14/23, for a four-year outcome-oriented framework of programme priorities for the eighth replenishment period aligned with the draft post-2020 global biodiversity framework.

35. Reporting on the thematic consultations on transparent implementation, monitoring, reporting and review, held in Rome on 20–22 February 2020, Mr. Alfred Oteng-Yeboah (Ghana), Co-Lead of the consultations, said that participants had had convergent views on the following areas: the key role of National Biodiversity Strategies and Action Plans as a planning tool; the importance of national reports as a monitoring tool; the value of a facilitative rather than punitive review process; the need to build flexibility to take account of national circumstances; the need for and value of inclusivity in all parts of the process; the need for global stocktaking; and the need to avoid overly cumbersome processes and streamline reporting. Ms. Rosemary Paterson (New Zealand), Co-Lead, described the new concepts that had emerged during the workshop, which included: thematic rather than, or in addition to, comprehensive reviews; action plans that sat underneath the NBSAPs as a more agile tool; an implementation support committee; and a small set of global headline indicators that all parties would report on. There had also been considerable discussion on timelines for planning, monitoring, reporting and review that took into account the connections between global and national processes. As a next step, the co-leads would be compiling the elements and options arising from the consultation for further consideration by the Parties.

36. The Working Group heard reports on dialogues on the post-2020 global biodiversity framework facilitated by Parties and others since the first meeting of the Working Group.

37. With respect to landscape approaches, Mr. Oteng-Yeboah summarized the outcomes of the expert thematic workshop held in Kumamoto, Japan, 3-6 September 2019, as contained in the workshop report.¹ Held back-to-back with the Eighth Global Conference of the International Partnership for the Satoyama Initiative, the workshop had generated three conclusions: (a) landscape approaches can foster transformative change because of people's connection to nature in their own landscapes and seasces as

¹ <https://satoyama-initiative.org/wp-content/uploads/2019/06/UNU-IAS-Landscape-Expert-Thematic-Workshop-Report-final-1.pdf>

socioecological systems with nature-culture linkages; (b) landscape approaches by definition considered the perspectives of all stakeholders in the landscape, and therefore reconciled conflicts and trade-offs, and helped to align policy at multiple levels; and (c) landscape approaches had multiple benefits for mainstreaming of biodiversity, area-based conservation, resilience and disaster-risk reduction, among other things.

38. Regarding consultations on human rights as an enabling condition in the post-2020 global biodiversity framework, Ms. Polina Shulbaeva (Center for Support of Indigenous Peoples of the North/Russian Indigenous Training Center, Russian Federation) summarized the outcomes of the thematic workshop held in Chiang Mai, Thailand, 18-20 February 2020. The key messages from the workshop included: human rights and a healthy planet are mutually dependent; and to bend the curve of biodiversity loss we must bend the curve of inequality, meaning that the post-2020 global biodiversity framework must deal better with governance, human rights and equitable sharing of benefits and costs. A number of key changes to the zero draft were needed to embed human rights in the post-2020 global biodiversity framework. Those included incorporating a goal that addressed nature and people's mutual and interdependent well-being rather than only ecosystem services and nature's benefits to people, and setting targets to address: recognizing and implementing, nationally and globally, the right to a clean, healthy, safe and sustainable environment; securing the rights of indigenous peoples and local communities to their lands, territories, resources and systems of governance, knowledge and practices; providing a safe and enabling environment in which environmental defenders, with particular attention to indigenous peoples, local communities and women, could operate free from threats, harassment, intimidation and violence; and halting the expansion of unsustainable and inequitable models of economic growth that harmed both biodiversity and human rights, including unsustainable mining, industrial agriculture and large infrastructure projects. Furthermore, in the current target 2, relating to protected areas, the term "strict protection" should be defined or deleted to avoid continued and repeated human rights violations, and a reference to equitable governance of protected areas and other effective conservation measures should be included. The full text of the recommended changes to the zero draft was contained in the workshop report.²

39. For mainstreaming of biodiversity, Ms. Theresa Mundita Lim, co-chair of the Informal Advisory Group on Mainstreaming of Biodiversity, reported on work done since November 2019 on the development of a long-term approach to mainstreaming in support of the development of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework. Mainstreaming biodiversity was a central component of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework and its theory of change, linked to at least 8 of the 20 proposed action targets. It was arguably the component of most significance for meeting the ambitious goals of the framework, from net gains to resource mobilization and transformative change, and was essential to addressing the urgency of biodiversity loss. Mainstreaming required a whole-of-government and even a whole-of-society approach where all actors, from the global to the local level, cooperated. Business, particularly the financial sector, and society in general needed to be as engaged as Parties. The group's main message was that mainstreaming should be moved up in the zero draft to an overarching position such as the chapeau. The group's position was set out in more detail in the progress report prepared for the current meeting.³

40. The representative of the Secretariat then updated the Working Group on upcoming consultations.

41. For capacity-building and technical and scientific cooperation for the post-2020 global biodiversity framework, a two-day thematic consultation would be held immediately following the current meeting. The consultation, held in response to decisions XIII/23 and 14/24, was an opportunity for Parties, indigenous peoples and local communities and relevant organizations to review and discuss issues surrounding the long-term strategic framework for capacity-building beyond 2020 and the draft proposals to strengthen technical and scientific cooperation. The Acting Executive Secretary would use

² Available at <https://www.forestpeoples.org/en/post2020-Global-Biodiversity-Framework>.

³ <https://www.cbd.int/doc/c/bb51/b5cd/7710cb4ac2d839522477404d/wg2020-02-mainstreaming-en.pdf>

the outcome of the consultation to prepare a draft long-term strategic framework for capacity-building and further develop the proposals to strengthen technical and scientific cooperation, for consideration by the Subsidiary Body on Implementation at its third meeting in May 2020.

42. For sustainable use of biological diversity, the Secretariat would convene a consultation from 30 March to 1 April 2020, in Bern, Switzerland. Two webinars would be organized during the first week of March to help participants prepare for the workshop, and the outcome of the workshop would be submitted to the Working Group for consideration at its third meeting.

43. For access and benefit-sharing, the Secretariat recalled the one-day consultation held prior to the first meeting of the Working Group and sought input from the Working Group on the need for further consultations and the modalities and timing of a potential consultations workshop.

44. Mr. Matthew Bird (United Kingdom) informed the Working Group that Scotland would host a workshop for subnational, regional and local governments on their role in the post-2020 global biodiversity framework, to be held in Edinburgh, 1 to 3 April, to which all were invited. The workshop would provide an opportunity to share best practice and learn lessons from projects around the world so that subnational actors could demonstrate leadership in taking forward actions that enabled every level of government to achieve the transformational change needed, in line with their devolved competence. The outcome of the workshop would be reported to the Subsidiary Body on Implementation at its third meeting.

45. A representative of the United Nations Environment Programme provided an update on the upcoming second consultation workshop of biodiversity-related conventions on the post-2020 global biodiversity framework, known as Bern 2, to be held in Bern, on 25–27 March 2020. Participants in the workshop would include party representatives from the various conventions, based on regional balance and, to that end, invitations had been sent to the convention secretariats and the chairs of the bureau standing committees of each convention to nominate party members of those bodies. The objectives of the workshop were to identify concrete elements that could be included in the post-2020 global biodiversity framework and mechanisms for the monitoring and review of its implementation, and to identify ways in which other conventions could contribute to the development of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework and its operationalization.

46. Following the presentations on the various consultation meetings, the Parties agreed to reserve their statements for the discussion under agenda item 4 on the post-2020 global biodiversity framework and, consequently, to close the present item.

ITEM 4. POST-2020 GLOBAL BIODIVERSITY FRAMEWORK

47. At the 2nd plenary session of the meeting, on 24 February 2020, the Working Group took up agenda item 4. In considering the item, the Working Group had before it a notes by the Co-Chairs of the Working Group and the Executive Secretary containing the zero draft text of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework (CBD/WG2020/2/3), a preliminary draft monitoring framework for the goals and targets (CBD/WG2020/2/3/Add.1) and a glossary (CBD/WG2020/2/3/Add.2).

48. The Co-Chairs introduced the zero draft document. Mr. Ogwal reviewed the input to the document, the overall structure of the draft framework and the philosophy behind it, while Mr. van Have provided additional details on the goals, selected indicators and 2030 action targets, as well as elements at an earlier stage of development, including implementation support mechanisms, enabling conditions, responsibility, transparency, outreach, awareness and uptake. The Co-Chairs stressed that their role was to explain the zero draft document and receive the input of the Working Group, not to advocate for the ideas contained in the document.

49. Statements were made by representatives of Argentina, Australia, Belarus, Brazil, Canada, Chile, China, Colombia, Cuba, Ecuador, Ethiopia, the European Union and its 27 member States, Georgia, Ghana, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Jordan, Malaysia, Mexico, Morocco, New Zealand, Norway, Peru, the Russian Federation, Singapore, South Africa (on behalf of the African Group),

Switzerland, Tuvalu (on behalf of the Pacific small island developing States), the United Kingdom and Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of).

50. At the 3rd plenary session of the meeting, on 25 February 2020, the Working Group resumed discussion of the zero draft text of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework.

51. Statements were made by representatives of Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Eritrea, Japan, Lebanon, Mongolia, the Philippines, the Sudan, the Syrian Arab Republic, Uganda and Viet Nam.

52. Further statements were made by representatives of the Convention on the Conservation of Migratory Species of Wild Animals (CMS), the Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species of Wild Fauna and Flora (CITES), the Convention on Wetlands of International Importance Especially as Waterfowl Habitat (Ramsar Convention on Wetlands), FAO, the International Treaty on Plant Genetic Resources for Food and Agriculture, the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights (OHCHR), the United Nations Environment Programme, the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization, the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development, the United Nations Development Programme, United Nations University Institute for Advanced Study of Sustainability, the United Nations Entity for Gender Equality and the Empowerment of Women (UN-Women), the Advisory Committee on Subnational Governments and Biodiversity (also on behalf of Local Governments for Sustainability, the Group of Leading Subnational Governments towards Aichi Biodiversity Targets and the European Committee of Regions) and the World Bank.

53. Statements were also made by representatives of the African Wildlife Foundation, BirdLife International (also on behalf of Conservation International, International Fund for Animal Welfare, The Nature Conservancy and Wildlife Conservation Society), Business for Nature, the CBD Alliance, the China Biodiversity Conservation and Green Development Foundation, the Forests for Life Partnership, Global Biodiversity Information Facility (GBIF), GYBN, Group on Earth Observations Biodiversity Observation Network (GEO BON), IIFB, International Planning Committee for Food Sovereignty, International Tropical Timber Organization, World Wildlife Fund for Nature and participating scientists from University of Cambridge Conservation Leadership Alumni Network, Target Malaria's 14 research partners from North America, Europe and Africa including Imperial College London, University of Wageningen and University of Ghent.

54. At the 5th plenary session of the meeting, on 28 February 2020, the Co-Chairs presented a draft recommendation for adoption by the Working Group, contained in document CBD/WG2020/2/CRP.1.

55. Statements were made by representatives of Argentina, Brazil, Canada, Chile, European Union and its 27 member States, Japan, Mexico, Norway and South Africa.

56. The Co-Chair said that a revised draft recommendation would be prepared for the consideration of the Working Group, based on the views expressed.

57. At the 6th plenary session of the meeting, on 29 February 2020, the Working Group considered revised draft recommendation submitted by the Co-Chairs (CBD/WG2020/2/CRP.1/Rev.1).

58. Statements were made by the Chair of the Subsidiary Body on Scientific, Technical and Technological Advice and the Chair of the Subsidiary Body on Implementation.

59. Statements were also made by representatives of Argentina, Australia, Brazil, China, the European Union and its 27 member States, Mexico, Norway, South Africa and Switzerland.

60. Following the discussion, the Co-Chairs said that a revised version of the recommendation would be prepared, taking into account the views expressed, and would be included in an annex to the report of the meeting.

1. Section on goals for the post-2020 global biodiversity framework

61. At the 4th plenary session of the meeting, on 27 February 2020, the Working Group considered a written summary of the discussions of the contact group prepared by the co-leads.

62. Statements were made by representatives of Argentina (on behalf of the Latin America and Caribbean Group), Brazil, Canada, Chile, the European Union and its 27 member States, India, Mexico, Norway, the Russian Federation, South Africa, Uganda, the United Kingdom and Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of).

63. The Co-Chairs said that the co-leads' summary would be revised in line with the views expressed and included in an annex to the report of the meeting.

2. Section on reducing threats to biodiversity

64. At the 4th plenary session of the meeting, on 27 February 2020, the Working Group considered a written summary of the discussions held in the contact group prepared by the co-leads (CBD/WG2020/2/CRP.1-Annex, Part 2).

65. Statements were made by representatives of Argentina, Brazil, Colombia, Ethiopia, the European Union and its 27 member States, Japan, Malawi, Mexico, Norway, Uganda and the United Kingdom.

66. The Co-Chairs said that the views expressed would be taken into consideration in revising the co-leads' summary, adding that discussions in the contact group were ongoing.

67. At the 5th plenary session of the meeting, on 28 February 2020, the Working Group considered a summary of the further discussions in the contact group, prepared by the co-leads (CBD/WG2020/2/CRP.1-Annex, Part 3).

68. Statements were made by representatives of Australia, Canada, Mexico and Senegal.

69. The Co-Chair said that the co-leads' summary would be revised in line with the views expressed and included in an annex to the report of the meeting.

3. Section on meeting the needs of people

70. At the 5th plenary session of the meeting, on 28 February 2020, the Working Group considered a summary prepared by the co-leads of the contact group on meeting people's needs (CBD/WG2020/2/CRP.1-Annex, Part 4).

71. Statements were made by representatives of Argentina, Australia, Brazil, Colombia, the European Union and its 27 member States, Japan, Mexico, Norway, Switzerland, Uganda, the United Kingdom and Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of).

72. The Co-Chairs said that the co-leads' summary would be revised in line with the views expressed and included in an annex to the report of the meeting.

4. Section on tools and solutions

73. At the 4th plenary session of the meeting, on 27 February 2020, the Working Group considered the section on tools and solutions and sections E–H of the zero draft, for implementation and mainstreaming.

74. Statements were made by representatives of Argentina, Australia, Brazil, Canada, Chile, Colombia, Eswatini (on behalf of the African Group on sections E and G), the European Union and its 27 member States, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Japan, Jordan, Malawi (on behalf of the African Group), Mexico, Morocco, Norway, Singapore, Switzerland, the United Kingdom and Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of).

75. Statements were also made by representatives of CITES, CMS, FAO and OHCHR.

76. Further statements were made on behalf of 27 non-governmental organizations and networks, the CBD Women's Caucus, GYBN, the International Petroleum Industry Environmental Conservation Association, Natural Justice and the University of Cambridge Conservation Leadership Alumni Network.

77. At the 6th plenary session of the meeting, on 29 February 2020, the Working Group considered a summary prepared by the co-leads of the contact group on tools and solutions (CBD/WG2020/2/CRP.1-Annex, Part 5).

78. Statements were made by representatives of Argentina, Australia, Chile, China, Colombia, Eswatini, the European Union and its 27 member States, Japan, Malawi (on behalf of the African Group), Mexico, New Zealand, South Africa, Switzerland and the United Kingdom.

79. Following the discussion, the Co-Chairs said that the co-leads' summary would be revised in line with the views expressed and included in an annex to the report of the meeting.

ITEM 5. OTHER MATTERS

80. [to be completed]

ITEM 6. ADOPTION OF THE REPORT

81. The present report was adopted at the [to be completed] session of the meeting on [to be completed], on the basis of the draft report presented by the Rapporteur (CBD/WG2020/2/L.1).

ITEM 7. CLOSING STATEMENTS

82. After the customary exchange of courtesies, the Chair declared the first meeting of the Working Group closed at [to be completed] on [to be completed].

Annex

[to be completed]