

Joint Submission from Australia, Canada, Colombia, Georgia, Mexico, New Zealand and Saint Lucia

Structure of the Updated Zero Draft of the Post-2020 Global Biodiversity Framework

This submission, jointly submitted by Australia, Canada, Colombia, Georgia, Mexico, New Zealand and Saint Lucia, aims at providing feedback to the Post-2020 Co-Chairs on the proposed structure for the Post-2020 Global Biodiversity as included in the Updated Zero Draft.

Firstly, we would like to thank the Co-Chairs for the Updated Zero Draft. We acknowledge the difficult work that lies ahead of them and want to express our highest gratitude for their hard work in trying to bring together everyone's views.

With respect to the framework, we are of the view that the Updated Zero Draft framework's structure is overly complicated and should be made simpler and more logical. We request that consideration be given to the following as potential means to address these concerns:

- a) 2050 goals which help to further describe the CBD's 2050 Vision. These could be guided by focusing on the CBD's three objectives, as well as other key and longer-term challenges such as means of implementation, supporting the ecosystem services that nature provides to people, and addressing the drivers of biodiversity loss. As these are longer-term, we understand that these goals will likely be more aspirational in nature and should not be action-oriented nor necessarily have numerical elements, so as to avoid confusion with the targets.
- b) 2030 targets which are SMART and should be both outcome- and action-oriented in nature, as needed. Focus should be placed, when appropriate, on targets that result in changes in the state of biodiversity and the services that ecosystems provide. However, we recognize that specific actions to 2030 can also be important to include, and these elements are welcome. In conclusion, we should welcome 2030 targets that are both outcome- and action-oriented as needed. For example, it may be appropriate to include a target that includes reference to a decrease in species extinctions by 2030 (outcome), whereas another target may include a reference to establishing spatial planning exercises (action).
- c) Eliminate 2030 milestones and incorporate their elements into the 2030 targets. Artificially separating "outcomes" from "actions" has not been helpful and has added a layer of complexity and confusion. As such, the concept of "2030 milestones" should be eliminated, and those outcome-oriented elements should be incorporated into the 2030 targets.

- d) Improve the logic of the framework. To the extent possible, there should be a logical flow between the 2030 targets and the 2050 goals, so that we all clearly understand how our efforts to 2030 will contribute to the 2050 goals and the overall 2050 Vision. We suggest a nesting format using an easily communicable organizational structure. The current proposed Theory of Change does not achieve this, in our opinion. For example, it currently has all of the 2030 targets contributing to all of the 2050 Goals. As a result, it is not clear how each of the proposed 2030 targets contributes to each of the 2050 goals and, therefore, if each of the proposed 2030 targets is needed.