

# Towards a new CBD Strategy 2021 - 2030

## 1. International Workshop

### Background information and objective

The following background information aims to support an efficient discussion on the key question of the first workshop about a new CBD strategy 2021-2030:

#### **Should the wording of the 2050 vision, the 2020 mission and the five strategic goals be maintained, adjusted, or replaced?**

To answer this question appropriately, the following aspects must be kept in mind according to the timeframe until 2050:

- There is urgency to act, because biodiversity loss and ecosystem degradation is still ongoing in an unprecedented way,
- The ambition must be high, significant, and punchy to achieve a systemic and transformational change in society and economy within the next thirty years,
- The appropriate suite of strategic goals until 2030 should be backed by sound science and other relevant evidence.

At the workshop a first round of deliberations on the wording of the vision, mission, and five strategic goals will be initiated. Therefore, the SUBMISSIONS FROM PARTIES, OTHER GOVERNMENTS, RELEVANT ORGANIZATIONS AND INDIGENOUS PEOPLES AND LOCAL COMMUNITIES ON THE PREPARATIONS FOR THE POST-2020 BIODIVERSITY FRAMEWORK (<https://www.cbd.int/post2020/submissions.shtml>), the CBD Secretariat's Information Note, 15 June 2017: APPROACHES FOR THE PREPARATION OF THE POST-2020 GLOBAL BIODIVERSITY FRAMEWORK, and CBD/SBSTTA/21/2: SCENARIOS FOR THE 2050 VISION FOR BIODIVERSITY incl. CBD/SBSTTA/21/2/ADD1: BIODIVERSITY AND THE 2030 AGENDA FOR SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT have been analysed. Relevant information and statements are briefly presented in the tables below.

The results of the discussion will be compiled in a report and provided to participants and other actors to follow-up on the ongoing deliberations.

### Background on Session 1 - The 2050 Vision

#### **Key questions:**

Does the vision still reflect the “target situation” for biodiversity and ecosystems we MUST achieve by 2050 in order to live “in harmony with nature”?

Are the strategic elements contained in the text still the important ones: valuing, conservation, restoration, wisely use?

Therefore, should the wording of the 2050 vision be maintained, adjusted, or replaced?

“Living in harmony with nature” where

**By 2050, biodiversity is valued, conserved, restored and wisely used, maintaining ecosystem services, sustaining a healthy planet and delivering benefits essential for all people.**

Rationale of the 2050 vision as to decision X/2 of the STRATEGIC PLAN 2011-2020

*Biological diversity underpins ecosystem functioning and the provision of ecosystem services essential for human well-being.*

CBD/SBSTTA/21/2:SCENARIOS FOR THE 2050 VISION FOR BIODIVERSITY, para 55 a) <i>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.</i> Note: such “elements” or “key terms” are ‘values’, ‘conservation’, ‘restoration’, wisely use/sustainable use’, ‘ecosystem services’, ‘healthy planet’, ‘benefit delivery’
View of Parties and Stakeholders according to submissions
IUCN: The current Vision is, in terms of content and scope, satisfactory. It is nevertheless phrased in passive and not active language. We feel that a long-term Vision for biodiversity conservation needs to be more specific, forward looking and enabling; more of a ‘call to action’.
Pro Natura: The overall mission of the strategic plan and the 3 goals of the CBD do not change, they cannot without challenging the CBD's very reason of being.
WWF: restore nature to more sustainable levels by 2050
WCMC: Development of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework should take account of the discussions at SBSTTA-21 and COP-14 on the 2050 vision and pathways for achieving it.
Women's caucus: remains very relevant after 2020; the realisation of such a vision where all people benefit requires a post-2020 global biodiversity framework that is well informed by views from women, including Indigenous women and grassroots women's groups.
MedPan: adding mentioning of 'protecting ecological functional units' in the Vision and 'strengthening resilience'
FPP: we agree that the 2050 Vision remains relevant and does not need to be revised or changed
UN Environment: We consider that the ‘entry points of actions’ identified in the Strategic Plan are still relevant, as is the Vision 2050 and Mission of the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020.
EU: future targets, and where appropriate milestones, should help and strengthen the implementation in view of achieving the 2050 vision

## Background on Session 1 - The 2020 Mission

### Key questions:

Does the mission still contain the important messages and terminology describing the necessary building blocks of a strategic pathway to 2030?

Is the mission still valid in its broad sense?

Should the mission be more focused on priority actions across the next decade 2021-2030?

Therefore, should the wording of the Mission be maintained, adjusted, or replaced in view of the 2030 challenges to achieve the 2050 vision?

The mission of the Strategic Plan is to **take effective and urgent action to halt the loss of biodiversity in order to ensure that by 2020 ecosystems are resilient and continue to provide essential services, thereby securing the planet's variety of life, and contributing to human well-being, and poverty eradication. To ensure this, pressures on biodiversity are reduced, ecosystems are restored, biological resources are sustainably used and benefits arising out of utilization of genetic resources are shared in a fair and equitable manner; adequate financial resources are provided, capacities are enhanced, biodiversity issues and values mainstreamed, appropriate policies are effectively implemented, and decision-making is based on sound science and the precautionary approach.**

Rationale of the 2020 mission as to decision X/2 of the STRATEGIC PLAN 2011-2020: <i>.... Unless urgent action is taken to reverse current trends, a wide range of services derived from ecosystems, underpinned by biodiversity, could rapidly be lost.... Scenario analysis reveals a wide range of options for addressing the crisis.... Achieving this positive outcome requires actions at multiple entry points, which are reflected in the goals of this Strategic Plan.</i>
CBD/SBSTTA/21/2 SCENARIOS FOR THE 2050 VISION FOR BIODIVERSITY, para 7 <i>A key purpose of the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020 is to begin slowing the rate of biodiversity loss through a range of actions at the various levels reflected in the goals of the Strategic Plan. For this reason, actions to directly address the loss of biodiversity and the benefits it provides (Goals C and D of the Strategic Plan) are complemented by actions to address the drivers of loss (Goals A and B).</i>
<b>View of Parties and Stakeholders according to submissions</b>
IUCN: Mission needs to be amended. New mission should be time bound to 2030. Mission should constitute an overall science-based target for biodiversity that can be quantified and tracked through implementation. Clear target like 2 degree goal.
Pro Natura: Keep close to the former one.
WWF: The CBD needs to rally around a simple and clear scientific message comparable to the “2°C scenario”. Unite the world around a single clear, articulate and measurable overarching objective of halting and reversing biodiversity loss by 2030.
WCMC: still relevant.
UN Environment: We consider that the ‘entry points of actions’ identified in the Strategic Plan are still relevant, as is the Vision 2050 and Mission of the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020.
Egypt: need to address Peace, Conflicts, and Food Security in post 2020 Framework.

## Background on Session 2 - The five strategic goals until 2030

<b>On the Strategic Plan in general and the set of five Strategic Goals</b>
CBD/SBSTTA/21/2 SCENARIOS FOR THE 2050 VISION FOR BIODIVERSITY, para 7 <i>A key purpose of the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020 is to begin slowing the rate of biodiversity loss through a range of actions at the various levels reflected in the goals of the Strategic Plan. For this reason, actions to directly address the loss of biodiversity and the benefits it provides (Goals C and D of the Strategic Plan) are complemented by actions to address the drivers of loss (Goals A and B).</i>
CBD Secretariat: APPROACHES FOR THE PREPARATION OF THE POST-2020 GLOBAL BIODIVERSITY FRAMEWORK, Information Note, 15 June 2017, para 19: <i>A straight-forward updating would suggest a “Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2021-2030” .....maintaining or adjusting the five goals.</i>
<b>View of Parties and Stakeholders according to submissions</b>
WCMC: Produce and communicate a post-2020 global biodiversity framework that has clear relevance and actions for all sectors of society. Framework and any goals/targets within it need to be easily understood in terms of desired outcomes. A clear conceptual framework demonstrating the relationship between any strategic goals and targets is important for subsequently creating NBSAPs with strategic goals and targets that are mutually supportive, and lead to linking silos of actions in Ministries, sectors etc.. Not making all of the targets equal, or at least having core targets around biodiversity conservation and secondary ones that are perhaps less fully defined. Any goals and targets developed need to be seen as a single integrated package.
Norway: The structure of the existing strategic plan is not necessarily the structure that is best suited to meet the needs of the parties post 2020. We find the 5 goals still to be highly relevant.
IUCN: The five Strategic Goals align well with the widely-used and intuitive DPSIR framework (Drivers, Pressures, State, Impacts, Responses), which we see as valuable in providing logical structure to the current Strategic Plan, and important to retain.

Egypt: need to address Peace, Conflicts, and Food Security in post 2020 Framework.
GFC: we recommend the establishment of a process to integrate community conservation approaches in each of the existing and future areas of work of the CBD, and all aspects of the post-2020 framework.
FPP: Strategic Plan should expand its focus from biodiversity to the relationship between biological and cultural diversity.
UN Environment: You might propose to Parties to agree on the principle that the post-2020 global biodiversity framework should not, and in no part of it, fall below the ambition of the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020.
GFC: The CBD, including the post-2020 framework, should be repositioned as the foundation for all sustainable development and wellbeing. This includes re-focusing the CBD on biodiversity for the sake of the entire planet, rather than an anthropocentric focus on “services” and economic / financial valuation of biodiversity and nature.

**Key questions:**

Are the five strategic goals still the frame of relevant strategic pathways up to 2030 to make significant progress in the right direction achieving the 2050 vision?  
Therefore, should the five strategic goals be maintained, adjusted, or replaced?

<b>Strategic Goal A: Address underlying causes of biodiversity loss by mainstreaming biodiversity across government and society</b>
Rationale as to decision X/2 of the STRATEGIC PLAN 2011-2020, para 10 a: <i>Initiating action to address the underlying causes of biodiversity loss, including production and consumption patterns, by ensuring that biodiversity concerns are mainstreamed throughout government and society, through communication, education and awareness, appropriate incentive measures, and institutional change.</i>
CBD/SBSTTA/21/2 SCENARIOS FOR THE 2050 VISION FOR BIODIVERSITY No explicit statement available
View of Parties and Stakeholders according to submissions
IUCN: Keep Goal A.
Pro Natura: Keep Goal A. The fact that the Strategic Plan's goals and targets have not been achieved should not be a reason to change them. Their achievement is necessary and indispensable to preserve the life on this planet, we must not change the strategy simply because we have done too little to implement it.
BirdLife: include separate targets for business
FPP: Address the underlying causes of loss of biological [and cultural diversity] by mainstreaming biological [and cultural diversity [or them] ] across government and society.
B&L evolution: integrate biodiversity into companies, which have an important role as for sustainable production and consumption, and a strong capacity to mobilize their stakeholders.
EU: plan should address the main drivers of the biodiversity loss

<b>Strategic Goal B: Reduce the direct pressures and promote sustainable use Conclusion and wrap-up of the session</b>
Rationale as to decision X/2 of the STRATEGIC PLAN 2011-2020, para 10 b: <i>Taking action now to decrease the direct pressures on biodiversity. Engagement of the agricultural, forest, fisheries, tourism, energy and other sectors will be essential to success. Where trade-offs between biodiversity protection and other social objectives exist, they can often be minimized by using approaches such as spatial planning and efficiency measures. Where multiple pressures are threatening vital ecosystems and their services, urgent action is needed to decrease those pressures most amenable to short-term relief, such as over-exploitation or pollution, so as to prevent more intractable pressures, in particular climate change, from pushing the system “over the edge” to a degraded state.</i>

CBD/SBSTTA/21/2 SCENARIOS FOR THE 2050 VISION FOR BIODIVERSITY No explicit statement available
View of Parties and Stakeholders according to submissions
IUCN: Keep Goal B.
Pro Natura: Keep Goal B.
FPP: Reduce the direct pressures on biological and cultural diversity and promote sustainable use.
B&L evolution: goal in which companies are the most mobilized (certification), but still not enough

<b>Strategic Goal C: Improve the status of biodiversity by safeguarding ecosystems, services and genetic diversity</b>
Rationale as to decision X/2 of the STRATEGIC PLAN 2011-2020, para 10 c: <i>Continuing direct action to safeguard and, where necessary, restore biodiversity and ecosystem services. While longer-term actions to reduce the underlying causes of biodiversity are taking effect, immediate action can help conserve biodiversity, including in critical ecosystems, by means of protected areas, habitat restoration, species-recovery programmes and other targeted conservation interventions;</i>
CBD/SBSTTA/21/2 SCENARIOS FOR THE 2050 VISION FOR BIODIVERSITY No explicit statement available
View of Parties and Stakeholders according to submissions
IUCN: Keep Goal C.
Pro Natura: Keep Goal C.
WWF: include guidance on how to manage landscapes and seascapes. Halt the trend of biodiversity loss by 2030.
MedPan: specific amendments to target 11
FPP: Improve the status of biological and cultural diversity by safeguarding ecosystems, species, genetic diversity and associated cultural and knowledge systems.
B&L evolution: think about the entire supply chain and to reinforce the polluter-pay principle, with the idea that the companies which removes must give back or restore the impacted ecosystems.

<b>Strategic Goal D: Enhance the benefits to all from biodiversity and ecosystem services</b>
Rationale as to decision x/2 of the STRATEGIC PLAN 2011-2020, para 10 d: <i>Efforts to ensure the continued provision of ecosystem services and to ensure access to these services, especially for the poor who most directly depend on them. Maintenance and restoration of ecosystems generally provide cost-effective ways to address climate change. Therefore, although climate change is an additional major threat to biodiversity, addressing this threat opens up a number of opportunities for biodiversity conservation and sustainable use.</i>
CBD/SBSTTA/21/2 SCENARIOS FOR THE 2050 VISION FOR BIODIVERSITY No explicit statement available
View of Parties and Stakeholders according to submissions
IUCN: Keep Goal D.
Pro Natura: Keep Goal D.
FPP: Enhance the benefits to all from the reciprocal contributions or relationship between people and nature.
B&L evolution: plans for fair and equitable sharing of benefits arising from the utilization of genetic resources are not yet very widespread, and we should reflect on a similar device for all the lines of business.

<b>Strategic Goal E:</b> Enhance implementation through participatory planning, knowledge management and capacity
Rationale as to decision x/2 of the STRATEGIC PLAN 2011-2020, para 10 e: <i>Enhanced support mechanisms for: capacity-building; the generation, use and sharing of knowledge; and access to the necessary financial and other resources. National planning processes need to become more effective in mainstreaming biodiversity and in highlighting its relevance for social and economic agendas. Convention bodies need to become more effective in reviewing implementation and providing support and guidance to Parties.</i>
CBD/SBSTTA/21/2 SCENARIOS FOR THE 2050 VISION FOR BIODIVERSITY No explicit statement available
View of Parties and Stakeholders according to submissions
IUCN: Keep Goal E.
Pro Natura: Keep Goal E.
Conservation International: Affirm existing commitments to financing biodiversity; Integrate guidance on resource mobilization (including approaches to increasing finance both internationally and domestically, also e.g. guidance on integrating biodiversity into international development finance, into climate change finance and/or guidance on the removal of perverse incentives).
Women's caucus: Commit funds and budgeting for gender activities.
MedPan: establishing innovative sustainable financing mechanisms.
FFP: Enhance and mainstream implementation through integrated participatory planning, knowledge management and capacity building.
B&L evolution: Companies can participate in the application of action plans for biodiversity and have the capacity to participate in research on biodiversity and to spread scientific knowledge to their stakeholders.
Norway: The post 2020 system must integrate a stronger focus on implementation.
EU: strengthen implementation in view of achieving the 2050 vision

## Background on Session 2 - Link to other strategic approaches related to CBD

<b>Link to the Agenda 2030 and the SDGs</b>
CBD Secretariat: APPROACHES FOR THE PREPARATION OF THE POST-2020 GLOBAL BIODIVERSITY FRAMEWORK, Information Note, 15 June 2017 (para 19): <i>Enhancing the links with the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development and the Sustainable Development Goals</i>
CBD/SBSTTA/21/2/Add1 BIODIVERSITY AND THE 2030-AGENDA FOR SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT <i>COP recognized the strong interdependence between the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020 and the Sustainable Development Goals. Aichi Biodiversity Targets are more specific to biodiversity and include more detailed elements than the corresponding targets under the Sustainable Development Goals. The 2030 Agenda should be considered in any follow up to the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity.</i>
View of Parties and Stakeholders according to submissions
EU: The follow-up to the strategic plan could be fully coherent with, build on and add value to the related SDGs; The follow-up to the Strategic plan will need to be taken into account when implementing the biodiversity-related SDGs, notably current elements with a horizon of 2020. Should encourage enhanced use of existing tools and mechanisms across biodiversity related conventions, including systems for reporting, indicators and information sharing, and improve those tools where necessary.... Such tools should be aligned with other international processes including SDG indicators and IPBES.

<p>IUCN: The post-2020 global framework for the conservation of nature must ... not only be fully aligned to the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development but also tracked systematically to demonstrate its contributions towards achievement of the SDGs. IUCN believes that once a new post-2020 biodiversity target framework is agreed those (SDG) Goals and targets concerned should not only be updated but also be strengthened and meaningfully taken up in the SDG process. IUCN believes that it is essential to build synergies in both implementation and reporting. Following agreement of the new biodiversity framework (at CBD COP15 in 2020) a mechanism should be agreed that allows simultaneous reporting towards the SDG Goals and targets.</p>
<p>BirdLife: It will also be important to recognize and explicitly build in the linkages between the new strategic plan for biodiversity and other biodiversity-related conventions and processes, in particular the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development. The post-2020 biodiversity targets must be aligned with and support the achievement of the Sustainable Development Goals, which highlight the importance of tackling drivers of biodiversity loss and environmental degradation across sectors.</p>
<p>WCMC: At first sight some of the Aichi targets have been superseded by targets under the SDGs, so particular consideration may need to be given to reorienting or reframing the post-2020 global biodiversity framework with respect to issues such as national accounting, subsidies, incentives, and sustainable consumption and production.</p>
<p>Norway: Coordination and alignment with the SDGs and SDG process is necessary. The High Level Political Forum on Sustainable Development is important due to the direct link between Aichi targets and some SDG subtargets.</p> <p>We encourage coordination and alignment with the SDGs and SDG process. Some key words are communication &amp; public awareness and indicators &amp; reporting. This will make the reporting process more effective as parties are already familiar with these indicators, in addition the use of indicators from the SDGs might assist the implementation of the broader 2030 agenda.</p> <p>Having the post 2020 strategy span from 2020-2030 would nicely align the CBD process with the possible renegotiation of the SDGs. However, we believe consideration also must be given to when updated biodiversity frameworks would have the highest input to potential new global processes following the SDGs (post 2030).</p>
<p>Conservation International: Given the importance of the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development, specifically the SDGs, in driving development action and funding, targets should be formulated to ensure the protection and sustainable management of nature, which is essential for achieving the SDGs. Ensuring complementarity between the new CBD strategic plan and the SDGs is therefore critical for efficient implementation of both. Effective alignment with the SDGs can help prevent isolation of biodiversity and ecosystem services from the social and economic goals that they underpin and allow biodiversity values to be mainstreamed into other sectors.</p>
<p>FPP: one way to build better synergies with SDGs is to include an emphasis on local biological and cultural plans and how they would enhance local sustainable development plans under the 2030 sustainable development agenda.</p>
<p>GPPC: we strongly agree that the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development and the Sustainable Development Goals provide both an important enabling framework for the implementation of the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020 and for the follow-up to the Plan.</p>
<p>Women's caucus: It is important that the post-2020 strategic plan and Targets are streamlined with SDG 5 on achieving gender equality and empowering all women and girls, as the current Strategic Plan and Aichi Targets reflect almost no gender considerations. The new framework should follow that of the SDGs, in which environment, social and economic concerns are fully integrated, and in which gender equality is both a standalone goal and a key cross-cutting theme.</p>
<p>GFC: Harmonisation between the CBD and SDGs is very important and welcome. Integration of biodiversity into the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development cannot be a one-way street; biodiversity policy makers should also make a much greater effort to effectively integrate the different SDGs into biodiversity policies and actions. The post-2020 framework forms a unique opportunity to embrace a more human rights-based, transformative and socially just approach to biodiversity conservation that is in line with the thrust of Agenda 2030.</p>

<b>Link to other biodiversity-related conventions and their strategies?</b>
CBD Secretariat: APPROACHES FOR THE PREPARATION OF THE POST-2020 GLOBAL BIODIVERSITY FRAMEWORK, Information Note, 15 June 2017, para 19: <i>Enhancing the relevance of the Plan to the other biodiversity-related conventions</i>
<b>Link to other relevant major global agendas</b>
CBD Secretariat: APPROACHES FOR THE PREPARATION OF THE POST-2020 GLOBAL BIODIVERSITY FRAMEWORK, Information Note, 15 June 2017, para 19: <i>Enhancing the links with the Sendai Framework for Disaster Risk Reduction, the Paris Agreement on Climate Change, the Degradation Neutrality Goals on the United Nations Convention to Combat Desertification, etc.</i>
<b>View of Parties and Stakeholders according to submissions</b>
EU: biodiversity should be on the agendas of relevant high-level events, or biodiversity meetings should be held in the margins of high-level events. The organisation of a Biodiversity summit in the margins of the UNGA should be explored. Particularly important is close cooperation with the other Rio Conventions, the biodiversity related MEAs, IPBES, UNEP, UNDP, GEF and FAO, among others.
IUCN: There is a need to substantially enhance coherence and cooperation between the CBD (and its Protocols), the other two Rio Conventions, and the other biodiversity-related conventions.
WWF: The process for the development of the new biodiversity framework should also ensure coordination and alignment with other key international processes and conventions, and in particular the other “Rio Conventions” (UNFCCC, UNCCD) as well as the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development. The new CBD Strategic Plan must also be aligned with related processes and receive input from these, for example the High-Level Political Forum (HLPF) on Sustainable Development, the UN Environment Assembly, the Sendai Framework on Disaster Risk Reduction, as well as other Multilateral Environmental Agreements. This would ensure coherence, multiply synergies and interconnections, as well as promote coordinated and effective implementation of all these frameworks for a significantly improved impact on biodiversity, human well-being, climate change and sustainable development at all levels.
WCMC: Other MEAs have welcomed and responded to the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020 and its Aichi Biodiversity Targets, and the targets have had a potentially significant impact on increasing coherence in implementation of MEAs because of this increase in appreciation of the relationships. This has also led to increased opportunity for collaboration at the national level. Liaison with other conventions/processes in developing the post-2020 agenda is therefore important for building on this. the post-2020 global biodiversity framework should clearly set out how it will underpin delivery of: - 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development - Paris Agreement under the UNFCCC - Sendai Framework on Disaster Risk Reduction
Norway: In our view UNEP, FAO and UNDP should be invited as main international partners for the process of developing the post-2020 global biodiversity framework. The secretariat should further explore options to engage with the other Rio-conventions (UNFCCC and UNCCD) in order to achieve increased attention to biodiversity and how improved management of biodiversity would contribute to goals under the respective processes, and also issues of joint interest having the SDGs in mind.
UN Environment: The post 2020 Global Biodiversity Framework should be useful for other strategic and action plans developed by biodiversity-related multilateral environmental agreements. It should allow them, if they decide to do so, to update their strategies in the light of it and the Sustainable Development Goals.

## Background on Session 3–Biodiversity Governance

### Input on Rethinking Biodiversity Governance

#### Christian Prip, FNI Norway

Christian Prip chaired a first meeting of experts, held at FNI headquarters at Polhøgda on 14 and 15 September 2017. The inaugural session was attended by prominent researchers, policy advisors and negotiators, as well as representatives of intergovernmental and non-governmental organizations, all working on various aspects of biodiversity governance.

The top item on the agenda was to identify the main challenges facing the current international biodiversity regime, and then try to map out a course for the future. A key objective for the network, which was initiated by programme leader Marcel Kok at the Netherlands Environmental Assessment Agency (PBL) together with FNI, is to share knowledge, fill research gaps, and offer concrete solutions and policy recommendations for reforming today's biodiversity framework. Specifically, the network will target the upcoming process of drafting a new post-2020 Strategic Plan for the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD).

#### Contact person for the project:

Günter Mitlacher

Director International Biodiversity Policy and CBD Focal Point / WWF Germany

Reinhardtstr. 18 / D-10117 Berlin

Direct: +49 (0)30 311 777-200 / Mobile: + 49 151 188 55 000

[guenter.mitlacher@wwf.de](mailto:guenter.mitlacher@wwf.de)

#### Project assistance by:

Dr Cornelia Paulsch

Institute for Biodiversity –Network (ibn)

Nussbergerstr. 6a / 93059 Regensburg

Direct: +49(0)941 381324-63 / Mobile: + 49 176 567 100 56

[cornelia.paulsch@biodiv.de](mailto:cornelia.paulsch@biodiv.de)



#### Further information:

<http://www.biodiv.de/en/projekte/aktuell/cbd-strategy.html>

Supported by:



Federal Ministry for the  
Environment, Nature Conservation,  
Building and Nuclear Safety

based on a decision of the German Bundestag