



## Convention on Biological Diversity

Distr.  
GENERAL

CBD/POST2020/PREP/1/1  
25 January 2019

ORIGINAL: ENGLISH

---

### PREPARATIONS FOR THE POST-2020 GLOBAL BIODIVERSITY FRAMEWORK

#### **POST-2020 GLOBAL BIODIVERSITY FRAMEWORK: DISCUSSION PAPER**

*Note by the Executive Secretary*

#### **I. BACKGROUND**

1. In decision [14/34](#), the Conference of the Parties to the Convention on Biological Diversity adopted a comprehensive and participatory process for the preparation of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework. The process requires that an initial discussion document summarizing and analysing the initial views of Parties and observers be made available in January 2019. Accordingly, the present document has been prepared, with the guidance of the co-chairs of the Open-ended Intersessional Working Group to Support the Preparation of the Post-2020 Global Biodiversity Framework, to support the ongoing consultation process. This initial discussion document will be further developed in an iterative manner, drawing on the subsequent comments on it by Parties, observers and stakeholders, and various consultations, inputs and review processes.

2. The present document draws upon relevant decisions and recommendations adopted by the Conference of the Parties to the Convention and its Protocols as well as its subsidiary bodies, which are summarized in section II below, and the submissions made in response to recommendation [2/19](#) of the Subsidiary Body on Implementation, which are summarized in section III. A total of 95 submissions were received, of which 21 were from Parties. Some Parties and observers submitted more than once, and some submissions were on behalf of multiple Parties and/or stakeholders.<sup>1</sup> It also presents, in section IV, a set of discussion questions which Parties and observers may wish to consider when providing further views on the scope and content of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework. The questions are not intended to be limiting or to prejudge the outcomes of the process for developing the post-2020 global biodiversity framework but, rather, to facilitate the submission of further views and perspectives as well as discussions.

#### **II. RELEVANT DECISIONS**

3. Decision 14/34 sets out the process for developing the post-2020 global biodiversity framework, including the role of the intersessional meetings of the Convention's subsidiary bodies, including the Open-ended Intersessional Working group on the Post-2020 Global Biodiversity Framework (hereafter "Working Group on Post-2020"), which is co-chaired by Mr. Francis Ogwal (Uganda) and Mr. Basile van Havre (Canada), and informal consultations. Parties and a wide range of stakeholders are encouraged to actively engage in the process. The decision also establishes a set of principles (participatory, inclusive,

---

<sup>1</sup> A more comprehensive synthesis of views is provided in a supplementary document (CBD/POST2020/1/INF/1).

gender responsive, transformative, comprehensive, catalytic, visible, knowledge-based, transparent, efficient, results-oriented, iterative and flexible) to guide the process. Further, decision 14/34:

(a) Provides that the post-2020 framework should be accompanied by an inspirational and motivating 2030 mission as a stepping stone towards the 2050 Vision “Living in harmony with nature”, and that it should be supported by a coherent, comprehensive and innovative communication strategy;

(b) Urges Parties and stakeholders, to actively engage and contribute to the process of developing a robust post-2020 global biodiversity framework, to facilitate dialogues on the post-2020 global biodiversity framework and to provide timely financial contributions and other support to the process for developing the post-2020 global biodiversity framework, including by offering to host global, regional, sectoral, or thematic consultations on this issue;

(c) Invites Parties and stakeholders when organizing meetings and consultations relevant to biodiversity and ecosystem functions and services, to consider dedicated sessions or space to facilitate discussions on the development of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework;

(d) Invites Parties and other Governments to consider developing, as appropriate to the national context, individually or jointly, and on a voluntary basis, biodiversity commitments which, among other things contribute to an effective post-2020 global biodiversity framework;

(e) Encourages indigenous peoples and local communities and all relevant organizations and stakeholders to consider developing, prior to the fifteenth meeting of the Conference of the Parties, biodiversity commitments that may contribute to the achievement of the three objectives of the Convention, strengthen national biodiversity strategies and action plans (NBSAPs), facilitate the achievement of the [Aichi Biodiversity Targets](#) and contribute to an effective post-2020 global biodiversity framework and to make such information available as a contribution to the [Sharm El-Sheikh to Beijing Action Agenda for Nature and People](#);

(f) Sets out that the process will be gender-responsive by systematically integrating a gender perspective and ensuring appropriate representation, particularly of women and girls, in the process (in addition, the Conference of the Parties, in decision [14/18](#), specifically requested the Executive Secretary to include discussions on the linkages between gender and biodiversity, and the lessons learned from implementation of the [2015-2020 Gender Plan of Action](#) within the regional consultations);

(g) Notes decision [14/20](#) on digital sequence information on genetic resources.

4. Complementary decisions were adopted by the Parties to the Cartagena and Nagoya Protocols to the Convention:

(a) Decision [CP-9/7](#) of the Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety stresses that biosafety should be reflected in the post-2020 global biodiversity framework and sets out steps towards the preparation of the biosafety component of the post-2020 framework. The decision also sets out a process for developing a specific Implementation Plan for the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety as a follow-up to the Strategic Plan for the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety for the period 2011-2020;

(b) Decision [NP-3/15](#) of the Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Nagoya Protocol welcomes decision 14/34 of the Conference of the Parties and invites Parties to the Protocol to participate in the process for developing the post-2020 global biodiversity framework. It also encourages Parties to undertake measures to enhance the implementation of the Nagoya Protocol on Access and Benefit-Sharing, in the context of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework and requests that the Compliance Committee at its next meeting consider how to support and promote compliance with the Nagoya Protocol within the post-2020 global biodiversity framework.

5. Further, decisions of the Conference of the Parties to the Convention contain provisions relevant to the development of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework. These include the following:

(a) Decision 14/34 requests the Ad Hoc Open-ended Working Group on Article 8(j) and Related Provisions to provide recommendations concerning the potential role of traditional knowledge, customary sustainable use and the contribution of the collective actions of indigenous peoples and local communities to the post-2020 global biodiversity framework, in support of the work of the open-ended intersessional working group;

(b) Decision 14/20 establishes a science- and policy-based process on digital sequence information on genetic resources with an extended Ad Hoc Technical Expert Group. The Working Group on Post-2020 is to consider the outcomes of the Ad Hoc Technical Expert Group and make recommendations on how to address digital sequence information on genetic resources in the context of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework;

(c) Decision [14/22](#) affirms that resource mobilization will be an integral part of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework and initiates preparations on this component at an early stage in the process of developing the framework, in full coherence and coordination with the overall process for the post-2020 framework. The process for considering this issue requests the Executive Secretary to contract a panel of experts to prepare reports on several issues related to the Strategy for Resource Mobilization to help inform the work of the Working Group on Post-2020 and the Conference of the Parties;

(d) Decision [14/23](#) welcomes the successful conclusion of the seventh replenishment of the Global Environment Facility Trust Fund, and expresses appreciation for the continuing financial support from Parties and Governments for carrying out the tasks under the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020 in its remaining years, and for supporting the implementation of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework in its first two years;

(e) Decision [14/24](#) requests the Executive Secretary to organize regional and stakeholder-specific consultative workshops and online discussion forums, in conjunction with the preparatory process for the post-2020 global biodiversity framework, to contribute to the preparation of the draft long-term strategic framework for capacity-building beyond 2020 and to submit a draft for consideration by the Subsidiary Body on Implementation at its third meeting;

(f) Decision [14/3](#) establishes an Informal Advisory Group on Mainstreaming of Biodiversity, to advise the Executive Secretary and the Bureau on further development of the proposal for a long-term approach to mainstreaming biodiversity including on ways to integrate mainstreaming adequately into the post-2020 global biodiversity framework, to be submitted to the Subsidiary Body on Implementation for consideration at its third meeting;

(g) Decision [14/30](#) of the Conference of the Parties to the Convention on Biological Diversity requested the organization of a workshop to facilitate discussions among Parties of the various biodiversity-related conventions to explore ways in which the conventions can contribute to the elaboration of the framework and identify specific elements that could be included in the framework;

(h) Decision [14/1](#) requests the Executive Secretary to use the regional assessments on biodiversity and ecosystem services and other outputs of the Intergovernmental Platform on Biodiversity and Ecosystem Services in the preparation of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework under the Convention;

6. In addition decision [14/2](#) of the Conference of the Parties welcomed the conclusions of the Subsidiary Body on Scientific, Technical and Technological Advice regarding scenarios for the 2050 Vision for Biodiversity and noted their relevance to the discussions on the long-term strategic directions to the 2050 Vision for Biodiversity, approaches to living in harmony with nature and the process of developing a post-2020 global biodiversity framework. Among these conclusions are the following:

(a) The 2050 Vision of the Strategic Plan remains relevant and should be considered in any follow-up to the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020. The 2050 Vision contains elements that could be translated into a long-term goal for biodiversity and provide context for discussions on possible biodiversity targets for 2030 as part of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework;

(b) The pathways towards a sustainable future, while plausible, require transformational change (...) Further work is required to identify ways and means by which the Convention and the post-2020 global biodiversity framework can leverage such change.

7. Finally, other decisions highlight issues to be considered in the post-2020 framework: the linkages between biodiversity and climate change (decision 14/5); the conservation and sustainable use of wild and managed pollinators (decision 14/6); knowledge management under the Convention and its Protocols (decision 14/25); process for aligning national reporting under the Convention and its Protocols (decision 14/27); and evaluation of the effectiveness of policy measures (decision 14/28).

### III. SUMMARY OF THE SYNTHESIS OF SUBMISSIONS

8. The submissions received on the scope and content of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework, synthesized in an information note (CBD/POST2020/1/INF/1), address a number of general themes. Below is a summary of the synthesis.

9. Many of the submissions received to date have focused on general issues or concepts. An exception to this general trend is the issue of biodiversity targets, as numerous suggestions on the possible wording for new targets have been made. On the basis of the submissions to date, the following general issues can be identified:

(a) The post-2020 global biodiversity framework needs to be commensurate with the challenges of fostering the transformational change required to address biodiversity loss and achieve the 2050 Vision;

(b) The post-2020 global biodiversity framework should serve as a universal framework for action on biodiversity;

(c) The post-2020 global biodiversity framework should serve to raise the profile of current biodiversity challenge, engage attention at a high political level and mobilize action from all stakeholders;

(d) The post-2020 global biodiversity framework should not be less ambitious than the current Strategic Plan for Biodiversity, the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development or any other biodiversity-related plan or framework adopted under a multilateral environmental agreement;

(e) The post-2020 global biodiversity framework should build on the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020. Many have suggested that this should be the starting point for discussions. However, there have also been suggestions to bring in new elements which would significantly expand the scope of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework in comparison with its predecessors. Conversely, some submissions have cautioned against expanding the scope of the framework;

(f) The post-2020 global biodiversity framework should link to and support, in a coherent and synergistic manner, other frameworks and processes which have a direct bearing on biodiversity, in particular the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development, the Paris Agreement on Climate Change, and other relevant processes adopted under the biodiversity-related conventions;

(g) The post-2020 global biodiversity framework needs to address the three objectives of the Convention in a balanced way and reflect issues related to access and benefit-sharing and biosafety;

(h) The different elements of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework should be linked through a conceptual framework. Some have suggested that this should be based on the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity while others have suggested alternative approaches, including a pyramid approach with

layers of objectives, actions and targets in support of an “apex goal” and combinations of outcome and output targets;

(i) The 2050 Vision of the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020 of “Living in Harmony with Nature by 2050” remains relevant and should be a part of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework. Many have noted the need to better articulate what this Vision means in concrete terms and various possible interpretations have been presented;

(j) The post-2020 global biodiversity framework should contain targets which are specific, measurable, ambitious, realistic and time-bound. These targets should be knowledge-based, including on scientific and traditional knowledge, address both desired outcomes and processes, be easy to communicate and be designed to galvanize action across society. There is support for using the Aichi Biodiversity Target as a starting point for discussing future targets. Some expressed the view that changes to the Aichi Targets should be kept limited. Others suggested more comprehensive changes, and numerous suggestions for additional or revised targets have been proposed;

(k) It has been suggested that the number of biodiversity targets should be limited to 20. However, given the ideas expressed for new targets, it appears that some would like to increase the number of targets. Conversely, there has also been a suggestion to limit the number of targets. Some have suggested using a nested target approach or developing sub-targets. The 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development has been suggested as a useful model in this respect;

(l) Indicators, building on those identified for the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020, should be identified and developed in parallel to the development of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework;

(m) The post-2020 global biodiversity framework should foster strong ownership and support concrete actions and contributions for its immediate implementation by Parties, other Governments, subnational and local governments, and cities, as well as indigenous peoples and local communities, relevant international organizations, civil society organizations, women’s and youth organizations, the private and financial sectors and other stakeholders;

(n) The NBSAPs should continue to be the main instrument for implementing the convention and the post-2020 global biodiversity framework. However, these need to be strengthened;

(o) The post-2020 global biodiversity framework should have a focus on implementation and have an effective process for monitoring and an effective review process to improve transparency and accountability. However, the specifics for accomplishing this beyond the established national reporting and voluntary peer-review process need to be determined. The establishment of a “ratcheting-up” mechanism and a compliance process was suggested. Similarly, the need to regularly review progress in implementation, possibly every two or five years, was raised;

(p) There is general support for voluntary commitments from Parties and the private sector. However, the statements have been general and have not articulated what this would entail in practice;

(q) The importance of developing a holistic resource mobilization strategy to mobilize resources from all sources was noted. Some also suggested that this strategy should incorporate an innovative financial mechanism. However, some expressed reservation regarding the role of the private sector in the implementation of the Convention;

(r) The post-2020 global biodiversity framework should have a coherent and comprehensive communication and outreach action plan to promote awareness of, and effective engagement in its implementation. This plan should encourage whole of societal engagement and reach beyond the biodiversity community;

(s) The post-2020 global biodiversity framework should effectively incorporate gender considerations and the perspectives of indigenous peoples and local communities;

(t) The post-2020 global biodiversity framework should have a focus on mainstreaming biodiversity within sectors and across society;

(u) Various gaps in the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020 have been identified. Some felt that these should be addressed in the post-2020 global biodiversity framework.

#### IV. ISSUES AND QUESTIONS FOR DISCUSSION

10. Based on previous decision and submissions from Parties and observers, a number of issue areas are identified below. Some questions to stimulate further discussion are also provided.

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

11. Many submissions suggested that a structure or approach is needed to link the different elements of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework and to highlight the linkages between its different elements. In the submissions, several different possible models or approaches were proposed. Some of the suggested approaches have been a pyramid or tiered structure while others have suggested structures similar to the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development and the current Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020. **Question: What could constitute an effective structure for the post-2020 global biodiversity framework, what should its different elements be, and how should they be organized?**

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

12. A general view is that the post-2020 global biodiversity framework should be ambitious and support the transformational changes needed to realize the 2050 Vision for Biodiversity. The post-2020 global biodiversity framework should serve as a universal framework for action on biodiversity and foster strong ownership and support for its implementation. **Question: In the context of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework, what would “ambitious” specifically mean?**

##### C. 2050 Vision for Biodiversity

13. Decision 14/2, sets out that the 2050 Vision “Living in harmony with nature” remains relevant and should be considered in the post-2020 global biodiversity framework. Further many submissions also indicated that the rationale for the 2050 Vision should be further developed and that a common and clear understanding of what reaching the 2050 Vision for Biodiversity entails in concrete terms needs to be developed. **Question: What, in real terms, does “living in harmony” with nature entail, what are the implications of this for the scope and content of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework and what actions are needed between now and 2050 to reach the 2050 Vision?**

##### D. Mission

14. Decision 14/34 specifies that the post-2020 framework should be accompanied by an inspirational and motivating 2030 mission as a stepping stone towards the 2050 Vision “Living in harmony with nature”, and that it should be supported by a coherent, comprehensive and innovative communication strategy. The need for a clear definition of what the mission statement means in practice was noted in many submissions and different suggestions for its formulation have been submitted. **Question: What would be the elements and content of an actionable 2030 mission statement for the post-2020 global biodiversity framework?**

### E. Biodiversity Targets

15. There is wide support for the post-2020 global biodiversity framework having a set of science- and knowledge-based “SMART” (specific, measurable, ambitious, realistic and time-bound) biodiversity targets for the period from 2021 to 2030. Several submissions noted that the Aichi Biodiversity Targets should be used as the basis for developing any new targets and that changes to these should be kept to a minimum. Alternatively, it was suggested that some “modernization” of the Aichi Targets might be required. Further, many submissions suggested possible new targets. **Questions:**

- (a) **What does “SMART” targets mean in practical terms?**
- (b) **How should the set of targets in the post-2020 global biodiversity framework relate to existing Aichi Biodiversity Targets?**
- (c) **How should the set of targets in the post-2020 global biodiversity framework align with other global targets, including those adopted under the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development?**

### F. Voluntary commitments and contributions

16. Decision 14/34 invites Parties and other Governments to consider developing biodiversity commitments which contribute to an effective post-2020 global biodiversity framework and encourages indigenous peoples and local communities and all relevant organizations and stakeholders, including the private sector, to contribute to the Sharm El-Sheikh to Beijing Action Agenda for Nature and People. Several submissions also commented on the desirability of voluntary commitments. However, others felt that voluntary commitments, while providing useful impetus, may not directly lead the global community to scientifically supported goals and outcomes. **Question: What form should voluntary commitments for biodiversity take and how should these relate to or be reflected in the post-2020 global biodiversity framework?**

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

17. Many submissions note that the post-2020 global biodiversity framework should be consistent with the commitments, frameworks, processes and plans established by the biodiversity related conventions and other multilateral environmental agreements. Similarly, the need for the post-2020 global biodiversity framework to be coherent with and supportive of the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development, the Paris Agreement, the other two Rio conventions, the other biodiversity-related conventions, and FAO processes among other were frequently noted. A general view expressed in several submissions is that the post-2020 global biodiversity framework should be used to reinforce synergies within the United Nations System. **Question: How could a post-2020 global biodiversity framework help to ensure coherence, integration and a holistic approach to biodiversity governance and what are the implications for the scope and content of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework?**

### H. Mainstreaming

18. Decision 14/3 recognized that mainstreaming is critical for achieving the objectives of the Convention, the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020, its Aichi Biodiversity Targets and the 2050 Vision for Biodiversity and should be one of the key elements of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework in order to achieve the transformational change required throughout society and economies, including changes in behaviour and decision-making at all levels. Further, in decisions 14/3 and XIII/3, several specific sectors were highlighted owing to their dependencies and impacts on biodiversity and areas for development of a long-term strategic approach to biodiversity mainstreaming were identified. Several submissions pointed to the need for the post-2020 global biodiversity framework to offer greater opportunities for the mainstreaming of biodiversity across society and to develop synergies with other

processes. The need to have a post-2020 global biodiversity framework which generates buy-in from sectors that are reliant on, and have significant impact on, biodiversity was also noted in many submissions. **Question: How can the post-2020 global biodiversity framework incorporate or support the mainstreaming of biodiversity across society and economies at large?**

#### I. Relationship with the current Strategic Plan

19. Many submissions note that the post-2020 global biodiversity framework should build from the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020. **Question: What are the lessons learned from the implementation of the current Strategic Plan? And how can the transition from the current decade to the post-2020 framework avoid further delays in implementation and where should additional attention be focused?**

#### J. Indicators

20. The importance of identifying indicators for the different elements of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework was noted in many submissions. Most suggested that the starting point for indicators should be the indicators developed for the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020 noted in decision XIII/28. The indicators used in the IPBES global assessment were also suggested. The need for indicators which could be used at the global and regional level was also noted. **Question: What indicators, in addition to those already identified in decision XIII/28, are needed to monitor progress in the implementation of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework at the national, regional and global scales?**

#### K. Implementation and NBSAPs

21. Many submissions noted the need to emphasize implementation in the post-2020 global biodiversity framework. The continued relevance of the NBSAPs for implementing the Convention was emphasized; however, many submissions also noted that the NBSAP process needs to be strengthened and accountability enhanced. Further many submissions noted the need for additional mechanisms to support implementation. **Question: How can the effectiveness and implementation of the NBSAPs be strengthened, what additional mechanisms or tools, if any, are required to support implementation of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework and how should these be reflected in the framework?**

#### L. Resource mobilization

22. Decision 14/22 affirms that resource mobilization will be an integral part of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework and decided to initiate preparations on this component at an early stage in the process of developing the framework, in full coherence and coordination with the overall process for the post-2020 framework. Further the decision also tasked an expert panel to undertake a number of activities, and to prepare reports, to contribute to the overall process for the post-2020 framework. The importance of resource mobilization, has also been underlined in many of the submissions. **Question: How should the post-2020 global biodiversity framework address resource mobilization and what implications does this have for the scope and content of the framework?**

#### M. Financial mechanisms

23. Decision 14/23 welcomes the successful conclusion of the seventh replenishment of the Global Environment Facility Trust Fund and expresses appreciation for the continuing financial support from Parties and Governments for carrying out the tasks under the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020 in its remaining years, and for supporting the implementation of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework in its first two years. **Question: How can the Global Environment Facility support the timely provision of financial resources to assist eligible Parties in implementing the post-2020 global biodiversity framework?**



## N. Review process

24. The need for an effective and timely review process for the post-2020 global biodiversity framework was noted in many submissions. In this respect, the continued importance of the national reports and the clearing-house mechanism of the Convention were highlighted. However, the need for more effective, robust and accountable national reporting was also highlighted. In addition, many submissions suggested additional mechanisms for reviewing progress in implementation and for building accountability and transparency. **Question: What additional mechanisms, if any, are required to support the review of implementation of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework and how should these be integrated into the framework?**

## O. Relationship between the Convention and the Protocols

25. Decision CP-9/7 provides that biosafety should be reflected in the post-2020 global biodiversity framework and sets out steps towards the preparation of the biosafety component of the post-2020 framework. The decision also sets out a process for developing a specific Implementation Plan for the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety as a follow-up to the Strategic Plan for the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety for the period 2011-2020. **Question: What are the issues associated with biosafety under the Convention and what are the implications for the post-2020 global biodiversity framework?**

26. Access and benefit-sharing is one of the three objectives of the Convention. Decision 14/31 and decision NP-3/15 specify that issues related to access and benefit sharing and the Nagoya Protocol should be considered in the development of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework. **Question: What are the issues associated with access and benefit-sharing under the Convention and what are the implications for the post-2020 global biodiversity framework?**

## P. Integrating diverse perspectives

27. Many submissions noted that the development and implementation of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework will require a “whole of society approach”. The need to have greater involvement of some specific groups was repeatedly emphasized in the submissions, including:

(a) *Indigenous peoples and local communities*: the Conference of the Parties to the Convention on Biological Diversity, in decision 14/34, requested the Ad Hoc Open-ended Working Group on Article 8(j) and Related Provisions to provide recommendations concerning the potential role of traditional knowledge, customary sustainable use and the contribution of the collective actions of indigenous peoples and local communities to the post-2020 global biodiversity framework, in support of the work of the open-ended intersessional working group. The continued role of indigenous peoples and local communities and the importance of traditional and local knowledge in the post-2020 global biodiversity framework was also noted in several submissions. **Question: How can the post-2020 global biodiversity framework facilitate the involvement of indigenous peoples and local communities and support the integration of traditional knowledge as a cross-cutting issue?**

(b) *Women and gender*: decision 14/34 specifies that the process for developing the post-2020 global biodiversity framework will be gender-responsive by systematically integrating a gender perspective. **Question: How should gender issues be reflected in the scope and content of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework?**

(c) *Subnational governments, cities and other local authorities*: it was observed that subnational governments, cities and other local authorities have an important role to play in on-the-ground implementation of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework and that this needs to be recognized. **Question: How should issues related to subnational governments, cities and other local authorities be reflected in the scope and content of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework?**

(d) *Civil society*: the need to enhance the participation, at the national, regional and international levels, of civil society in the post-2020 process was noted. **Question: How can the post-2020 global biodiversity framework facilitate the involvement of civil society in the development and implementation of the framework?**

(e) *Youth*: the need to promote youth participation in the development and implementation of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework was noted. **Question: How can the post-2020 global biodiversity framework facilitate the involvement of youth in the development and implementation of the framework?**

(f) *Private sector*: it was suggested in several submissions that there is a need for greater involvement of the private sector in biodiversity issues. **Question: How should issues related to the engagement of the private sector be reflected in the scope and content of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework?**

28. As noted above, many of the submissions have expressed a desire to integrate multiple and diverse perspectives in the post-2020 global biodiversity framework. As also noted above, some of the submissions have given particular attention to specific groups which should be involved and reflected in the post-2020 global biodiversity framework. **Question: How should the post-2020 global biodiversity framework reflect diverse and multiple perspectives?**

#### **Q. Communication and outreach**

29. Decision 14/34 specifies that the post-2020 framework should be supported by a coherent, comprehensive and innovative communication strategy. In addition, the need for effective, coherent, comprehensive and targeted communication, both during the development of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework and after its adoption, as well as the importance of ensuring that the framework can be easily communicated, were noted in many submissions. **Question: How should the post-2020 global biodiversity framework address issues related to communication and awareness and how can the next two years be used to enhance and support the communication strategy adopted at the thirteenth meeting of the Conference of the Parties to the Convention on Biological Diversity to ensure an appropriate level of awareness?**

---