Operationalising the Action Agenda for Nature and People: workshop report

Workshop organized by PBL Netherlands Environmental Assessment Agency, the Netherlands Ministries of Agriculture, Nature and Food and of Infrastructure and Watermanagement, with IDDRI, IUCN, IVM-VU and WCMC

Report by M.T.J. Kok, C. Bliss, A. Rankovic

11-12 April 2019, The Hague, The Netherlands

Corresponding author
Marcel.kok@pbl.nl

Author(s)
M.T. J. Kok (PBL)
C. Bliss (IVM-VU)
A. Rankovic (IDDRI)

PBL Netherlands Environmental Assessment Agency is the national institute for strategic policy analysis in the fields of the environment, nature and spatial planning. We contribute to improving the quality of political and administrative decision-making by conducting outlook studies, analyses and evaluations in which an integrated approach is considered paramount. Policy relevance is the prime concern in all of our studies. We conduct solicited and unsolicited research that is both independent and scientifically sound.

Contents

Executive summary

Rationale

At COP-14 of the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD), countries agreed to encourage state and non-state actors to develop biodiversity commitments that contribute to the achievement of CBD objectives and the development of the post-2020 biodiversity framework. Furthermore, what is now called the "Sharm El-Sheikh to Kunming Action Agenda for Nature and People", was launched.

The **"Action Agenda for Nature and People"** has the explicit aim to catalyse actions from all sectors and stakeholders in support of biodiversity conservation and its sustainable use. More specifically, its objectives are: (**1**) ***to raise public awareness about the urgent need to halt biodiversity loss and to restore biodiversity health; (2) to inspire and help implement nature-based solutions to meet key global challenges; and (3) to catalyse cooperative initiatives across sectors and stakeholders in support of the global biodiversity goals***. The action agenda, in particular through its objective 2, reminds that global key challenges, such as biodiversity loss and climate change, are linked and interdependent and can only be achieved in an integrated mutually supportive manner. An online platform hosted on the CBD website has been set up to map current global efforts, in order to assess impact and gaps and help increase ambition.

While countries have supported biodiversity commitments by states and non-state actors, it has yet to become clear what an "Action Agenda for Nature and People", prior to COP-15 and as part of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework, could look like and would entail in practice. To start exploring how the "Action Agenda for Nature and People" could be operationalised and implemented, an international workshop was organised in The Hague, on April 11 and 12, 2019.

General conclusions

There appears to be already a sizeable bottom-up non-state biodiversity activity internationally. The Action Agenda urgently needs to be recognised worldwide as an important opportunity to showcase the many activities for biodiversity in society, and to incentivise stakeholders to take up new commitments for biodiversity and accelerate short term action. Political leadership and broad support from society for the Climate Action Agenda played an important role for reaching the Paris Agreement. The Action Agenda for Nature and People could and should play a similar role for reaching an ambitious post-2020 global biodiversity framework with a view to become a legitimate part of the framework once established. However, it is clear that considering the urgency of the situation and the short time left until CBD COP 15, strong coalitions and smart collaboration with existing agendas and platforms is needed.

This means, first of all, that the narrative for the Action Agenda needs to be further developed, including explaining its priorities, functions and purposes, and widely communicated. Building on and collaborating with already existing platforms and networks the Action Agenda can align the expectations of different actors towards change (and attract new ones). Non-state actors have to see that there is much to gain from being part of this societal mobilisation, and much to lose if one is not a part of it.

In the short-term – prior to COP-15 – the Action Agenda can fulfil fundamental strategic functions in stimulating a positive political momentum, contribute to catalysing a groundswell of actions for biodiversity and in this way support an ambitious agreement in Kunming in 2020. In this way it can contribute to making the post-2020 framework a truly 'global deal for nature', that is felt and recognised beyond the inner circles of the CBD. Further efforts are needed to promote the Action Agenda, provide impetus, and to structure and coordinate activities and build coalitions and partnerships.

The development of Action Agenda for Nature and People can and must ride on the waves of societal concern worldwide for environment, nature and climate, and more broadly for sustainability and transformational change. In various policy domains Action Agendas, including commitment processes and portals, are also emerging as part of the international institutional frameworks. The CBD has to relate to and build on and collaborate with these processes in climate, oceans and SDGs, as many of these commitments are highly relevant for biodiversity and vice versa. Also, within the CBD, pledges have been made in the last few years by various non-state actors; these initiatives need to be included in the current process and lessons learned taken into account. Furthermore, a distinction needs to be made between commitments of individual citizens and non-state actors (organised stakeholders, business, civil society organisations (CSOs), nature conservation organisations, cities and regions, etc.). If a strong integrated Action Agenda emerges in the coming 18 months, a further engagement from the CBD and its parties will be expected by non-state actors and these actors need to be included in the post-2020 global biodiversity framework in a meaningful way. Beyond COP-15, the question then becomes if and how the Action Agenda can become part of the post-2020 framework and how the Action Agenda will relate to the existing and new CBD implementation mechanisms (NBSAPs, national reporting, accountability mechanisms, ratcheting).

The Biodiversity Action Agenda should become an important element of the implementation of the post-2020 global framework towards its future global goals, in synergy and in collaboration with other initiatives such as the Global Climate Action Agenda, the SDGs or the Ocean Commitments. This requires us not to look at the Action Agenda for Nature and People in isolation, but relate it to what is happening in these other policy domains. Many of the commitments made there are also highly relevant for biodiversity and should be made visible in the context of the CBD without having to be resubmitted to the CBD . Stressing the link and interdependence between biodiversity loss and other key societal challenges, such as climate change, will raise the political profile of biodiversity.

Area-based conservation measures can provide an important contribution to the Action Agenda, as many non-state actors (such as indigenous and local people, private land owners, farmers etc.) play an important role here and can make commitments to the Action Agenda. In the CBD context, the link is to the 'Other Effective Conservation Measures' (OECMs), as recently agreed upon at COP-14, and beyond that to other conservation measures in managed landscapes.

An important question is: how to leverage international initiatives and coalitions to achieve biodiversity goals? Learnings for success of multi-stakeholder partnerships include improved MRV procedures, enhanced involvement of relevant actors and the fact that disclosure is required to enhance transparency. To further enhance partnerships, science-based targets and methodologies that could be used at a national or sectoral level would allow non-state actors to set their own targets and actions to achieve these targets.

The Action Agenda will evolve over time. In the coming period it seems to be most important to generate as many commitments as possible and make them visible at the Portal for the Action Agenda to show the groundswell of action. This means submitting commitments, but

also linking with other action agendas/portals (ie climate and ocean). Encouraging actors to start engaging should be done with little formal burden, but with some basic process criteria, nonetheless, to ensure credibility: pledge/commitments (ambition), how you intend to achieve (measures), willingness to report and how (in any way). Agreement that this will be publicly available and transparent to facilitate learning. After COP-15, accountability requirements will need to increase.

A portal to bring all commitments together and showcase them is an important element of the Action Agenda, but should not be seen as the only one. In the further development of the portal of the Action Agenda for Nature and People lessons from for example the NAZCA portal in the UNFCCC could be taken into account, while recognizing that within CBD context this Portal may look entirely different. These include: specify the goals of the platform (indeed mobilisation of action might be different than Monitoring, Reporting and Verification (MRV)); trade-offs exist between stringency in monitoring and reporting, and willingness to engage in the action agenda; leveraging the input of a network of data-providers and an "analytical community" (more productive and cost-efficient); the role of champions is key; expensive to implement; accountability/transparency – commitments do not necessarily translate to (fast) action.

MRV is essential to maintain the accountability of actors and commitments. The view from the workshop was that an MRV system which encourages experimentation and learning is likely to be more effective, compared to an approach that would focus too strongly on criteria and stringent MRV procedures. The right balance between mandatory registration criteria and accountability processes, and freedom of experimentation, must be found.

Challenges for the CBD regarding the Action Agenda include: to contribute to catalysing momentum; establish credible and ambitious commitments; avoid countries shirking their responsibilities; establish a system for measuring progress; and to create more meaningful space for non-state actors in CBD working operations.

The discussions and outcomes of the workshop reflect the challenge to build productive linkages between non-state initiatives at the one side and at the other the traditional, multilateral system and its national implementation. The Action Agenda may provide an important mechanism to make the CBD more inclusive .

Suggestions on the way forward for the Action Agenda

To draw conclusions on the way forward, at the end of the workshop four groups explored the way forward from the perspective of non-state actors, governments and the CBD, the further development of the portal and MRV, and area-based conservation. All groups identified necessary elements for the action agenda, short term priorities (until COP-15), medium term priorities (after COP-15) and linkages to other processes. On the next pages a summary of the practical suggestions that were identified, is presented. This is as far the discussions during the workshop have come; they do not present a consensus view and they are here offered as input in follow-up discussions within CBD and beyond.

Necessary elements for the Action Agenda
- Tying the platform to 3 objectives awareness raising, inspire nature-based solution, cooperative solutions
- Pre-2020 any pledge that contributes to biodiversity is good, little criteria necessary. Post-2020 pledges must match certain criteria and ensure there is a follow up mechanism

- Need to set: ambition/goals/targets (What) and commitments and actions to make it happen (How)
- Actions have to relate to biodiversity in broad sense ("all shades of green") by different sectors. Engage with Climate Action Summit and Ocean Summit
- Smart collaboration with existing portals and platforms. Building links and partnerships with others to support development. Mobilising additional actions – the CBD may need to move towards a meta-platform
- Incentives for different actor-groups to join the initiative.Tailor-made approaches for citizens / NGOs / Cities & Regions (sub-national) / Business & Sectors. For NGOs, consider both development & environmental NGOs with adjusted narratives
- Individuals need to be able to join or support initiatives created by any intermediary organisation support a movement. Create possibilities for individuals to sign up easy
- Governments need to convene, inspire, motivate, and invest in local level
- Creating a multipurpose platform to show case what is going on for both indivduals and networks & organisations as well as repository and interaction functions
- Linking further development to ongoing events, use social media
- Part of the agenda should be a meta-platform that brings together different existing area based commitment portals (e.g. at WCMC and Earthmind) and information on area-based conservation efforts
- Meta-platform should help guide new actors with new area based commitments to find the commitment portal that best suits their objectives
- The platform could be constructed around the distinction between protected areas, conserved areas/OECMs, and other areas, and should have a shared narrative around these categories and their significance. The narrative should point out that actions in all of these three categories matter.
- Parties may want to decide on where the platform should sit, UNEP-WCMC could be a candidate for this – but also other possibilities exist.

Short-term priorities for the Action Agenda
- Provide more clarity about the role/goal of platform as part of the broader agenda
- Find champions (people/groups) able to take the leadership national & global, showcase inspiring examples
- Frame and develop different narratives, building on what is happening in cities, business etc.
- Start at the national level to engage discussions and use the Regional Conservation Fora of IUCN to mobilise members in all countries
- Engage with coalitions working on sustainability but not (yet) on biodiversity to mobilise their partners and members
- Priority for the agenda of the CBD: develop roadmap for non-state actors with milestones for each CBD meeting
- Parties organise multiple events on the national level. These events should be targeted at diverse networks and include strong communication and outreach. Governments should consider investing in such events
- Governments would like to have a say in the goals, form and promotion/outreach of the Action Agenda and the link to similar instruments. It is proposed to put the item on the agenda of the CBD-OEWG in August-September and its follow up.
- Stream of activities worldwide (in conjunction with Egypt and China), side events at OEWG
- Connecting with other platforms to build critical mass and support. Pull together the most relevant commitment portals, and use their data/ input to populate the Action Agenda (area based)
- Developing local language versions of the platform, Enabling viral campaigns and 'challenges'. Sign up needs to be brought to the 21st century –social media
- Pay attention to restoration as a theme that will significantly grow in importance
- Communicate clearly that monitoring, reporting and verification is essential and will be a requirement; existing portals with reporting requirements will of course continue to do so
- Develop a lazy persons guide to area based conservation and other possible commitments, as a communication tool to get commitments flowing in

- On top of existing commitments, develop new input on the basis of pilots such as African Model Forest Network (community-based work in Congo basin), Finnish work on urban biodiversity, Indonesia programme on Critical Ecosystems, Dutch national commitment inventory by IUCN NL

Medium-term priorities for the Action Agenda
- Action Agenda should be a core element of the post-2020 framework following the example of the 'Agenda for Solutions' which is a core element of the Paris Agreement.
- This has helped to engage the non-state actors in the CBD process (without entering in negotiations). This could include a role in technical examination processes, stock taking, evaluation, high-level business events could be attended by ministers etc.
- Front-running governments could help and stimulate others to take the lead and come in an action modus. Regional meetings and meetings for certain sectors, and large scale science meetings should be put on the time line. It should be made sure that the manpower to do so is in place
- After 2020 be more precise with commitments (a 2-stage process)
- A biodiversity action network between NGO's. Governments could help make the right connections at international scale. Biodiversity action network organised by Chinese NGOs –can we help?
- Moving from quantity to quality in development of portal - targeted and structured approach
- Develop updating mechanisms e.g. on a yearly basis. Develop nudging mechanisms for reporting and accountability
- Further develop and implement metric and methodology for MRV to ensure long-term commitment will be delivered
- Linking commitments (commitment categories) with existing and new incentive schemes to help realise ambitions
- Consolidation/ maturation of the meta-platform will be needed, including identification of gaps (do we cover all sorts of needed commitments?)

Linking to other processes
- Activities as highlighted in the presentations of the WEF, natural capital Coalition and ICLEI
- Boosting mainstreaming – sector-wise, teams, champions. Involving developing countries
- Learning from Talanoa dialogue as an example of how meaningful inclusion of non-state actors in post-2020 framework could be achieved – how can we reach climate goals including non-state actors?
- The reporting criteria will need to be developed in conjunction with other sectors - All groups should work together as distinctions are arbitrary
- Will this platform be fed or will this platform feed other platforms, or a bit of both?
- Green list – best of class measure of commitments

Introduction

At COP-14 of the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD), countries agreed to encourage state and non-state actors to develop biodiversity commitments that contribute to the achievement of CBD objectives and the development of the post-2020 biodiversity framework. Furthermore, the "Sharm El-Sheikh to Beijing Action Agenda for Nature and People" was launched. Note that with the transfer of the location of COP-15 to Kunming, the name of the Action Agenda has changed accordingly. In the following the shorter and widely recognised term 'Action Agenda for Nature and People' is used.

The "Action Agenda for Nature and People" has the explicit aim to catalyse actions from all sectors and stakeholders in support of biodiversity conservation and its sustainable use. This Action Agenda has three objectives: **(1) to raise public awareness about the urgent need to halt biodiversity loss and to restore biodiversity health; (2) to inspire and help implement nature-based solutions to meet key global challenges; and (3) to catalyse cooperative initiatives across sectors and stakeholders in support of the global biodiversity goals.** The action agenda, in particular through its objective 2, reminds that global key challenges, such as biodiversity loss and climate change, are linked and interdependent and can only be achieved in an integrated mutually supportive manner. An online platform has been set up hosted on the CBD website to map current global efforts, in order to assess impact and gaps and help increase ambition. The challenge is now to fill this space with numerous, ambitious and credible initiatives on biodiversity.

An action agenda was of central importance in the leadup to the UNFCCC COP-21, and the Paris Agreement would very likely not have been reached without the catalysing effect and channelling of energy that the climate action agenda enabled. The climate action agenda benefitted from the leadership of the UN General Secretary and the UNFCCC COP Presidents (Peru and France). Creating momentum and operationalising of the "Action Agenda for Nature and People" is one of the main tasks on the road to COP-15. The importance of this task has recently been highlighted by Presidents Xi Jinping and Emmanuel Macron: in their joint declaration on 26 March 2019, China and France committed to work together to promote the Action Agenda and mobilise all stakeholders, in order to build concrete proposals for biodiversity action.

CBD COP Decision 14/34 encourages indigenous peoples and local communities and all relevant organisations and stakeholders, including the private sector, to consider developing, prior to COP15, biodiversity commitments that may contribute to an effective post-2020 global biodiversity framework and to make such information available as a contribution to the Sharm El Sheikh to Kunming Action Agenda. It also invites Parties and other governments to consider, on a voluntary basis, developing biodiversity commitments that: contribute to the achievement of the three objectives of the Convention; strengthen National Biodiversity Strategies and Action Plans (NBSAP); facilitate the achievement of the Aichi Targets; and contribute to an effective post-2020 global biodiversity framework and to share this information.

Some issues need further clarification. A distinction is made between biodiversity commitments of state and non-state actors, and further developments since COP14 have raised several questions that require an urgent answer. On substance, more clarity is needed on what such commitments could look like, and how state and non-state commitments could complement and reinforce each other. Another general issue concerns the organization of the action agenda, its structure, and leadership to promote the action agenda. There could be two stages: pre COP 15 to raise momentum through coalition, partnerships and additional

new pledges from all and post COP 15 to anchor the Action Agenda to the post-2020 framework and linking it to the formal processes and mechanisms of the CBD.

So, while countries have supported biodiversity commitments by both states and non-state actors, it has yet to become clear what an "Action Agenda for Nature and People", prior to COP-15 and as part of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework, could actually look like and what it would entail in practice. How non-state commitments would relate to the (voluntary) biodiversity commitments of states is also in question.

The aim of this workshop was to start exploring how the "Action Agenda for Nature and People" could practically be developed and implemented in the coming 18 months prior to COP-15, and beyond as part of the post-2020 global framework for biodiversity. Furthermore, an understanding is needed of how commitments of non-state actors would relate to the biodiversity commitments of states, as well as to the implementation mechanisms of the convention (existing and possible new ones). The workshop considered lessons from other processes (including the UNFCCC action agenda and the SDGs and the oceans commitment process) and explored how the Action Agenda could relate to other processes. With this, we wanted to address the question of what the Action Agenda needs to become to contribute to a renewal of global biodiversity governance, and to improve results for biodiversity than has been accomplished in the last decades.

The workshop was organised by PBL Netherlands Environmental Assessment Agency in collaboration with the Netherlands Ministries of Agriculture, Nature and Food; Infrastructure and Watermanagement, in addition to IDDRI, IUCN, The Institute of Environmental Studies (IVM) at Vrije University Amsterdam and WCMC. It brought together 30 international and national policy makers, stakeholders and experts (see participants list in Annex 2). This report synthesizes the rich discussions that occurred during the workshop, gives a summary of the expert and stakeholder presentations and provides an executive summary of the workshop discussions that were held under Chatham House rules. We hope the report will inform the future development of the Action Agenda in the run up to COP15 and will provide useful insights for the post-2020 framework.

1. Perspectives on the Action Agenda: where are we since COP-14?

To start discussions on operationalising the Action Agenda, the workshop participants exchanged their views and insights on it. Since COP-14 in Egypt, only a few public statements have been made in support of the Action Agenda and some initiatives have become visible since then. The thinking in the secretariat of the CBD (sCBD) on the Action Agenda was briefly introduced by Margaret Egbula.

As a bridge between the current strategic plan/UN Decade on Biodiversity and the post-2020, the Action Agenda is a top priority for the Secretariat. From a communications standpoint, the Action Agenda is an opportunity to shift the narrative on biodiversity: from 'we are failing on the ABTs' to 'we are not giving up, and we're making a big final push for real progress'. Target audiences for the Action Agenda include parties and traditional partners, who can make big commitments with significant impact for the ABTs. But we are also targeting small groups and individuals – not so much for impact but because each individual commitment represents a personal investment in biodiversity and will spark conversations that put biodiversity into daily discourse, leading to greater awareness, advocacy and action. The role of the Secretariat is to facilitate. It's for the parties to define the specifics and to drive the initiative forward. So far we've seen strong engagement from China and Egypt and keen interest from delegates at the Africa Regional Consultation. This workshop is another encouraging sign of engagement from the CBD community. The Action Agenda's success will require sustained engagement from parties and partners, not just making commitments but also spreading the word among their networks.

Views from the workshop

The workshop identified the following points that need to be taken into account in developing the Action Agenda:

- The Action Agenda urgently needs to be globally recognised as an important opportunity to showcase the many activities for biodiversity in society that are currently not well recognised, and needs to incentivise stakeholders to take up new commitments for biodiversity. At UNEA in Nairobi, a portal was launched by the CBD for stakeholders to submit their commitments to the Action Agenda. However, to contribute to creating momentum, the Action Agenda needs to become more than a portal and to be seen as a broad landscape of actions and events.
- In the short-term – until COP-15 - the Action Agenda has to contribute to catalysing a groundswell of actions for biodiversity, to realise the ambitions of a 'global deal for nature', that is felt and recognised beyond the inner circles of the CBD.
- The Action Agenda can and must ride on the currently mounting wave of societal concern worldwide for climate and more broadly for sustainability. The increasing attention on natural climate solutions/nature based solutions can raise the profile of biodiversity. The fact that nature conservation is a crucial part to resolving broader societal problems has to be communicated and coalitions and partnerships need to be strengthened and built.
- A distinction needs to be made between commitments of individual citizens and non-state actors (organised stakeholders, business, civil society organisations (CSOs), nature conservation organisations, cities and regions, etc.).
- It needs to be realised that since COP-11 in Hyderabad, non-state actors have already made pledges and commitments to the CBD in various ways. Have these been engaged in the development of the Action Agenda and will they be included in the portal? There

is a need to follow up on these commitments and evaluate what their result has been, in order to learn lessons.

- In various domains, Action Agendas emerge. There are already many portals and pledges and the CBD has to relate to, collaborate with and build on these processes, as many of these commitments are highly relevant for biodiversity and vice versa.
- Beyond the COP, the question becomes if and how the Action Agenda can become part of the post-2020 framework. If a strong Action Agenda emerges in the coming 18 months, it will be necessary to engage further with non-state actors and continue to include them in the plans and the post-2020 framework.
- Over time, the issue of monitoring, reporting and verification (including a discussion on metrics and criteria) will become more important. In the coming 18 months it seems to be most important to get as many commitments as possible; however, after COP-15, accountability requirements need to increase.
- An underlying challenge for Parties and the UN system is how to build productive linkages between non-state initiatives and the traditional, multilateral system and its national implementation. The Action Agenda may provide an important mechanism to make the CBD a more inclusive mechanism for biodiversity governance.

2. The Action Agenda towards COP-15, and as part of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework

This session addressed the question of the political importance and functions of the Action Agenda towards 2020 and beyond, the link to national biodiversity commitments, the connections to the broader post-2020 framework and its implementation mechanisms (NBSAPs, national reporting, accountability, ratcheting mechanism) and the potential to link to other action agendas (in for example oceans, climate, SDGs). Two presentations introduced this session.

Presentations

Structuring the action agenda for biodiversity and linking it with post-2020 negotiations and implementation, *Aleksandar Rankovic and Matthieu Wemaere, IDDRI, Paris.*

The Action Agenda is by no means anecdotal. It fulfils fundamental strategic functions to stimulate a positive political momentum *prior* to COP15, and to help achieve an ambitious agreement in Kunming in 2020. There is, therefore, an urgent need to energise the Action Agenda as soon as possible. In the short term (from 2019), efforts are required to explain its importance, provide impetus, and to structure and coordinate activities. As many initiatives as possible must be mobilised, which may be organised according the Aichi objectives or activity sectors, for example, and a decision should be made regarding who could play the coordinator role, alongside Egypt, China, and the Secretariat.

At COP15, the decision could be made to anchor the Action Agenda within the CBD, to support the implementation of the post-2020 global framework. It will be important to consider how commitments that are credible and measurable could be valorised, while linking them to the intergovernmental framework. Bodies which could manage the Agenda could include the Secretariat, the clearing house mechanism, or the SBI. After 2020, the Biodiversity Action Agenda should support the implementation of the CBD and the post-2020

global framework towards its future global goals, in synergy with similar initiatives such as the Global Climate Action Agenda or the Ocean Commitments.

The action agenda as part of the post-2020 Global Biodiversity Framework, *Marcel Kok, PBL, The Hague.*
A non-state action agenda can contribute in a myriad of ways to the post-2020 global biodiversity framework, including engaging more actors, fulfilling an implementation gap, creating positive momentum for biodiversity and fostering innovative and experimental governance arrangements. Beyond the creation of a groundswell of action in the run up to COP-15, the question is how can the Action Agenda become part of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework and are parties willing to do so? This would include looking at non-state actions as experimentation for 'bending the curve' and learn and build on that. Monitoring, reporting and verification on non-state action will ensure accountability and legitimacy. MRV mechanisms by stakeholders are emerging and can be built on. 'Biodiversity Gap Reporting' would contribute to a global stocktake and assessment of adequacy of commitments to identify gaps. If need to be, this could be combined with a ratcheting mechanism to increase ambition if targets are not met. Additionally, links to other issues such as climate and SDGs can be utilised to avoid new silos, and nature-based solutions could be a way to link different arenas.
Challenges for the CBD regarding the Action Agenda include: to contribute to catalysing momentum; establish credible and ambitious commitments; avoid countries shirking their responsibilities; establish a system for measuring progress; and to create more meaningful space for non-state actors in CBD working operations.

Views from the workshop

In the following discussion a number of questions were addressed:
Who will coordinate the Action Agenda? For climate, the COP20 and COP21 presidencies played an important role on the road to the Paris Agreement, but such a proactive role of the COP14 and COP15 presidencies is not yet visible . Who will fill this leadership gap in the short term available? The CBD Secretariat will be important, but more political legitimacy and support is needed. 'Champions' need to be identified. The open-ended working group on post-2020 could suggest a way forward and plan for the Action Agenda by the end of summer 2019 and parties could also coordinate to enhance legitimacy. Furthermore, the EU should be proactive on the Action Agenda and relate to developments in other regions of the world to ensure the Action Agenda is recognised globally as an important element for addressing key global societal challenges.

What is the narrative for the Action Agenda? We need to explain the priorities, functions, purposes of the Action Agenda. The Action Agenda can align the expectations of different actors towards change (and attract new ones). It must be clear for actors that there is much to gain from being part of this mobilisation, and much to lose if one is not a part of it.

Maintaining momentum despite political changes is required and will enable difficult discussions on the drivers of biodiversity loss, such as over-consumption, which is also a root cause for climate change. The Action Agenda can catalyse this action and channeling dispersed energy.

Synergies through nature-based solutions. We must use opportunities for synergies with other agendas through nature-based solutions, for example during the UN climate conference in September 2019.

The Action Agenda as part of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework It is also important that we think beyond 2015 and consider how the Action Agenda can contribute to the global deal for nature. Questions which need to be addressed include whether we understand the pathways for how we can bend the curve for biodiversity. It is essential that we move the discussion from the passive halting of biodiversity loss to actively bending the curve through restoration and conservation. Here, we can learn much from non-state initiatives, how and why are they contributing to bending the curve, not only directly but also by having indirect effects in terms of governance functions they provide and building a stronger governance system for biodiversity. Strong non-state support for biodiversity through the Action Agenda may help countries to decide on a strong global deal for nature.

Do we immediately need a system for monitoring, reporting and verification (MRV)?
MRV is essential to maintain the accountability of actors and commitments. This was, however, considered an issue that would become more important after 2020. In the short term we need as many commitments as possible to show the groundswell of action. After COP15, more strict criteria for MRV could be implemented. Furthermore, we need to understand that this is a different arena from climate change, in that there is a bigger need to incentivise actors to work collectively. Currently, there is a lack of credibility of the Action Agenda among NGOs because it is seen as a less ambitious agenda.

There is a need for building trust in the system by allowing public scrutiny, to foster a higher level of legitimacy. Mobilisation could be helped by selecting a few global goals and targets for biodiversity (like the 1.5/2 degrees targets in climate) to which commitments could be related. The use of science-based targets and the disaggregation of targets can provide a benchmark for actors to understand their contribution to resolving global issues.

There are already MRV practices in the non-state domain from which we can build (e.g. FSC; ISEAL) and there are lessons to be learnt from the climate regime. A strong Action Agenda would increase upward pressure in the system and demonstrate that there is demand from society for governments to play as stronger role. A ratcheting mechanism, for non-State actors, might thus also help put pressure on States to increase the ambition of their commitment.
MRV will allow for greater oversight as to whether the aggregated commitments will achieve biodiversity targets. Currently, it is difficult to assess specific countries, cities, sectors and companies.
Flexibility on commitments is important given the multiple stakeholders, but we should not compromise on monitoring. A reasonable timeframe for displaying measurable activity need not be too stringent, to avoid becoming a barrier.
Commitments will require credibility and legitimacy, which can be achieved through transparency. Indicators for self-assessment will need to be considered and obligatory regular reporting would ensure commitments are making progress. Verification is also essential. This could be conducted by an NGO network, as is the case for the climate regime. A Yearbook for Biodiversity Action has also been touted.

What are the challenges for CBD?
- Momentum for CBD is still lacking, but nature concerns are raising concerns expressed – *inter alia* by the young demonstrating for their future – non-state actors must be engaged as an integral part of the post-2020 agenda. The challenge is now to build coalitions and partnerships and contribute to filling this space with numerous, ambitious and credible initiatives on biodiversity and develop a vision and a practical way forward on how the non-state action agenda can become a meaningful part of the post-2020 framework.
- Clarify the distinction between biodiversity commitments from States and non-state actors. Commitments of State will be based on their NBSAPs and represent additional

efforts, aimed at achieving the Aichi targets before COP15 and aimed at achieving the new post-2020 targets after. The Action Agenda is for non-State biodiversity commitments, and whether these two types of commitments should be connected, and if yes how, is still an open question.

- The view from the workshop was that a registration and MRV system which encourages experimentation and learning is likely to be more effective, compared to an approach that would focus too strongly on criteria and stringent MRV procedures. The right balance between mandatory registration criteria and accountability processes, and freedom of experimentation, must be found.
- The Action Agenda will evolve over time. Encouraging actors to start engaging should be done with little formal burden, but with some basic process criteria nonetheless to ensure credibility: pledge/commitments (ambition), how you intend to achieve (measures), willingness to report and how (in any way), agreement that this will be publicly available and transparent to facilitate learning.
- Coordination and collaboration with other action agendas – this is urgently needed as we must not look at the Action Agenda for biodiversity in isolation, but relate to what is happening in climate, oceans, the SDGs etc. to harness the immense potential for synergy. Many of these commitments are also highly relevant for biodiversity and could and should be made visible in the context of the CBD, but not necessarily resubmitted by the initiatives themselves.

3. Mapping the emerging international non-state action landscape

In this session results were presented from two on-going projects that try to map the international landscape of non-state initiatives for biodiversity. The first presentation, in particular, looks at which international initiatives already work for biodiversity, while the second (in line with the ambitions of IUCN International), identifies international coalitions that are not yet working for biodiversity, but do work on sustainability and may also leverage their work for biodiversity in the near future. The discussion focussed on lessons that can be drawn from this mapping, the thematic and geographical distribution of current initiatives, possible gaps and especially opportunities this provides for the Action Agenda.

Presentations

Towards a Global Biodiversity Action Agenda: Mapping biodiversity-related governance initiatives, *Philipp Pattberg and Kate Negacz, IVM-VU, Amsterdam.*
Governance for biodiversity has expanded beyond the CBD, but the Aichi targets are still not being met. In the last two decades, the creation of transnational biodiversity initiatives has peaked around key events. Almost a quarter of initiatives are hybrid, involving public, private and civil society actors. However, more needs to be done to encourage private initiatives, in particular, which account for only 2% of the total. The majority of initiatives focus on information and networking (36%), followed by standards and commitments, financing and, finally, operational aspects. The majority highlight conservation as a key goal, rather than sustainable use, which is something that may need to be considered in the future direction of initiatives.

Positively, the geographic coverage of these initiatives is relatively even. However, 84% of initiatives focus on terrestrial biodiversity (SDG15), so there is less action in relation to our oceans. Of the Aichi targets addressed, the most common is education and knowledge sharing. With the fact that these targets are, overall, not being met, a question arises as to

how we can reverse this trend and to enhance action on less favoured targets. The next step requires an impact assessment to understand how initiatives differ in terms of output, outcome and impact and how they can contribute to the CBD agenda, and in turn be supported by the CBD.

Leveraging coalitions to achieve global biodiversity goals, *Florence Curet and Philippe Puydarrieux, IUCN International*
Supported by France, this on-going project aims at mapping coalitions involving non-state actors, active in sectors influencing biodiversity, with the objective to leverage higher scale voluntary commitments to curb pressures on biodiversity and support bold national action plans post-2020. Engaging with sectors identified as driving the biggest pressures on biodiversity, such as cities and regions, agriculture, forestry, but also actors involved in threats such as invasive species and pollution, can support the objective to address the underlying causes of biodiversity loss. Coalitions from these sectors willing to engage in sustainable development could improve their commitments to biodiversity by acting on pressures, and setting clear and quantified targets serving both nature conservation and the SDGs.

Additionally there is an opportunity to support the objective of "bending the curve" by engaging with influential cross-sectoral coalitions: for instance, the finance sector and think-tanks could support the adoption of higher standards for ecosystems, and initiatives promoting nature-based solutions can share their best practices. These coalitions could inspire higher scale voluntary commitments and better approaches for nature.
This on-going project is part of an overall approach for strong commitments by 2020: first assess the biodiversity impact of sectors and the national footprint, then set up science-based targets for sectors contributing to national science-based targets and last mobilise and support coalitions to make commitments to biodiversity.

Views from the workshop

There appears to be already a sizeable bottom-up non-state biodiversity activity internationally. Can this be reflected in the biodiversity Action Agenda? The non-state biodiversity regime is well-established. Often, initiatives are clearly linked to CBD themes and Aichi targets.
The present narrative is complex, and business opportunities less clear; biodiversity arenas are not necessarily attractive to business, therefore, there are fewer purely private initiatives, especially in comparison to the climate regime. In contrast to climate, hybrid multi-stakeholder partnerships are more common. And business often will prefer to be part of multi-stakeholder partnerships to increase legitimacy of their efforts.
What these initiatives have delivered for biodiversity is still largely unknown, with some exceptions where outcomes and first indications of impacts become visible. This is, for example, the case for voluntary sustainability initiatives, or for cities through the Singapore index.
Considering this landscape for structuring the Action Agenda, one possibility is to work along sectoral lines of key drivers. However, most of these initiatives are likely to be already registered elsewhere and a new platform will be seen as extra effort. A solution to this would be to ask a third party to aggregate this information.
Timeframes also needs to be considered; will commitments be open-ended or bound by a date to achieve their goal? This question still needs to be answered. Furthermore, a better understanding needs to be achieved about when outcomes and impacts may be expected from non-state initiatives.

How do we leverage coalitions to achieve biodiversity goals? Nature underpins sustainable development, but how do we make this more clear so that sustainability initiatives would also work more explicitly for biodiversity? This needs to be better articulated, and much can be learned from ongoing initiatives.

Learnings for success of multi-stakeholder partnerships include improved MRV procedures, enhanced involvement of local communities and the fact that disclosure is required to enhance transparency. To further enhance partnerships, science-based targets and methodologies that could be used at a national or sectoral level would allow them to set their own targets and to choose the theory of change to which they are committing. Additionally, combining top-down and bottom-up approach is likely to prove effective. Strategically working with coalitions to create "group effects" will complement individual commitments.

4.   Making the Action Agenda reality

This session turned the attention of the workshop towards on-going and emerging activities of non-state actors and their intentions and activities to contribute to the conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity, and as such to the realization of the goals and targets of the CBD. This provided a starting point to discuss how the CBD Action Agenda is perceived, under what conditions commitments would be made by non-state actors, etc.? The session provided insights from business, cities and the NGO community. A view on how different initiatives could join forces was provided.

Presentations

View from the World Economic Forum, *Akanksha Khatri, WEF*
Degradation is occurring globally and is already taking its toll on people. There is growing recognition of the risks these issues (which include failure of climate-change mitigation and adaptation and natural disasters) pose in terms of likelihood and impact. Environmental issues affect business are increasingly interconnected with other dimensions across the strategy landscape, requiring a more systemic view of the risks and opportunities. The WEF sees 2020 as a critical international milestone for reversing our course and shaping a new wave of public-private action. The theory of change for the "Nature Action Agenda" (WEF's initiative) comprises three elements: 1) Provide high-level leadership; 2) Build an economic and business case for nature and; 3) Unlock financing for nature. Our key actions tracks are six-fold and include: (Business) champions for Nature; a new nature macroeconomics report; financing for nature; communications and mobilisation; engagement with China; a fourth industrial revolution for nature.

A Business for Nature coalition, *Martin Lok, Natural Capital Coalition*
The Natural Capital Coalition was established by the natural capital community as a collaborative space to harmonise approaches and grow a supportive enabling environment for natural capital thinking. Its purpose is to mainstream the inclusion of natural capital in decision making, coordinating approaches and scaling them rapidly. Engaging business for nature is crucial because the current landscape of business initiatives is vast and fragmented; we need one voice. A Business for Nature coalition would give a voice to business leaders and align stakeholders on best in class commitments (ambitions) and solutions (actions). For this to happen, a compelling narrative is required with high level policy engagement. Scaling existing platforms for business commitments and advocating business solutions that deliver meaningful corporate targets and impacts will facilitate this. It will complement the already planned Action Agenda and will mobilise the business community to participate in the commitment framework and to align it with other sectors.

A cities and regional perspective on the Action Agenda, *Alice Reil, ICLEI*
ICLEI's vision is that all members shall acknowledge, respect and integrate (urban) biodiversity and ecosystem services into all land-use, development planning and associated policy decisions. By engaging local governments in contributing to global policy processes we can safeguard and strengthen biodiversity. In Europe, the Committee of the Regions is a key actor with which to engage. In the run-up to 2020, the challenge will be to consolidate local and subnational action and communicate regular updates, in close collaboration with a range of partners. Lobbying parties on the importance of cities and regions to the post-2020 framework will be a key goal and ICLEI plans to establish a CitiesWithNature reporting and engagement platform. Each Party should develop their National Biodiversity Strategy and Action Plan (NBSAP) with the support and involvement of subnational governments, cities and local authorities. Globally, cooperation in terms of technology and resources will increase the likelihood of success in terms of bending the curve for biodiversity.

WWF views on the action agenda, *Maelle Pelisson, WWF-UK*
Habitat loss, over-exploitation, pollution and climate change have led to the sixth mass extinction in the Earth's history. 5/10 of the most impactful global risks are related to nature loss and climate change (WEF 2019). WWF's vision of a New Deal for Nature and People is to reverse the loss of nature, protect and restore it by 2030 for the benefit of people and the planet. For this to occur in 2020, state and non-state actors must cooperate.
With regards to the CBD Action Agenda, non-state voluntary commitments should be included in the ratchet and review system of post-2020 targets. A set of guidelines for contributions will enable quantification and aggregation. The Action Agenda must also provide structured opportunities for a dialogue between State and Non-State actors to identify existing barriers to and discuss potential transformation solutions to scaling up action. Integrating it with the Marrakesh partnership and SDGs will also enhance synergies with other issue areas. We must move beyond an online platform to generate momentum and encourage the participation of non-state actors.

Joining forces: the view from the European Commission, *Karin Zaunberger, European Commission*
The Action Agenda and the process for voluntary commitments are key bottom-up tools for involving subnational governments, cities and other local authorities and stakeholders, civil society and the private sector. The main objectives of the action agenda are to raise public awareness about the urgent need to stem biodiversity loss, help to implement nature-based solutions and to catalyse cooperative action. A special emphasis will be placed on the Nature-Climate-Oceans-Water-Land nexus. There are several areas with which the biodiversity Action Agenda could join forces eg climate action agenda, ocean agenda to raise its profile and effectiveness. This would foster better integrated policies and contribute to mainstreaming biodiversity in other sectors.
The key goal is to strengthen the development and use of ecosystem-based approaches to achieve climate change mitigation and adaptation and disaster risk-reduction, and to combat land degradation, while simultaneously contributing to the conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity. The challenge is to build an Action Agenda which is is *linked, but distinct* or *distinct, but linked*. There is a great opportunity for synergy not to be missed.

Views from the workshop

The different presentations indicated that many initiatives and actions for biodiversity are currently being undertaken, and intentions exist to contribute to the Action Agenda for

biodiversity. It is clear however, that from a non-state actor perspective the link to the CBD is only a part of the whole story on mobilising for biodiversity.

The business perspective. The Business for Nature initiative will engage the corporate sector and policy sector to discuss natural capital, mirroring the experiences in the climate change arena to bring businesses with one voice to the COP. This coalition helps to align commitments and best practices. Addressing biodiversity is fundamental for businesses for long-term sustenance and strategy, both in terms of risks and dependencies as well as opportunities. Science-based targets are useful for businesses to understand what is needed to achieve the CBD agenda. High-level leadership is required (champions for nature), as well as an economic and business case for nature and unlocking financing for nature (from new sources and as part of climate finance).

Cities and regions, thus far, could be considered a blind spot in the development of an effective biodiversity regime. The CBD offers cities a broad portfolio of supportive services, tools and guidelines, but this is not followed up to the extent possible and the potential remains underused. From a European perspective, European local governments should work with national governments to the input to the CBD. Biodiversity strategies and action plans need to be integrated across levels and the Committee of the Regions is of key importance. Globally, the role of cities and regions biodiversity summits goes hand in hand with CBD COPs. Sub-national governments use this to demonstrate what we can do collectively to help meet global targets

Given the urgency, the Action Agenda should be beyond an online platform. It should provide space for discussion and exchange on barriers and solutions to halting biodiversity loss between all stakeholders. Currently, the CBD does not seem tangible to many. However, in spite of this all actors need to take responsibility and step up its contributions

A key goal for combining non-state initiatives taking place under different environmental conventions would be, from a nature perspective, to strengthen the development and application of nature-based approaches to achieve climate change mitigation and adaptation and disaster risk-reduction, and to combat land degradation, while simultaneously contributing to the conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity. Nature-based solutions must not do harm to biodiversity eg monoculture plantations for bioenergy must not be considered as nature-based solution to climate change. The principles and safeguards included in the voluntary guidance for the design and effective implementation of ecosystem-based approaches to climate change adaptation and disaster risk reduction adopted at CBD COP14 should be applied for nature-based solutions.

5. Tracking commitments – lessons learned from area-based conservation

This session took area-based conservation as its starting point to see how non-state action through area-based conservation could contribute to the conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity. In the CBD context the link is to the 'Other Effective Conservation Measures' (OECMs), as recently agree upon at COP-14.

Presentations

Area-based conservation measures - state of knowledge & tracking global commitments, *Naomi Kingston, WCMC*

Area-based conservation measures are not simply about designated protected areas. This is significant because only about 50% of areas important to biodiversity are in protected areas. Area-based measures have multiple benefits and link with other sectors and issue areas. Protected areas are performing well for biodiversity but can't outweigh the negative effects elsewhere. This is why indicators for biodiversity are not showing progress despite there being more commitments. Current restrictions are confusing as there are many area-based protections in place in the same area (protected areas; conserved areas; everywhere else). Area-based conservation spans all zones and national commitments are helping to increase coverage to meet terrestrial and marine targets in the context of the OECM discussion, but in general, actions and voluntary commitments matter everywhere.

Areas on which we have less information include a complete network of protected areas, privately protected areas, indigenous and community protected areas and sacred natural sites. All have a part to play, for example by creating connectivity corridors and covering implementation gaps. It is important that we scale up ambition, creating a new deal for nature. Understanding what biodiversity to prioritise is also a key question.

Lessons from the Verified Conservation Area approach-initiative, *Frank Vorhies, Earthmind*

In recent decades, the objectives and definition of conservation has changed. The concepts of sustainable use and conservation have been separated but should be united, it is the management action, delivering positive biodiversity outputs that matters. A Verified Conservation Area, therefore, recognises areas in which such actions take place, for whatever motive. These areas become a unit of natural capital in which it is possible to invest.

The emphasis now is on recognising actions: conserving areas where we live and work. Area-based conservation is voluntary; but how do you recognise it? The area needs a plan, baseline assessment, performance reports and, in time, auditing. Traditionally, the conservation sector has been lacking public annual reports. However, making such documents public will drive individuals, communities and companies to become involved. It will encourage corporate biodiversity mitigation and responsible commodity production through avoidance, minimisation, restoration and offsets.

Lessons from the VCA: the dominant vision of conservation is protectionism, this perspective should be broadened; there is a lack of know-how in planning and MRV; conservation needs to become a social movement; public support is needed to scale up voluntary conservation.

Views from the workshop

Understanding how areas should be classified is a grey area. Area-based conservation measures are no longer about designated protected areas. Protected areas are performing well for biodiversity but can't outweigh the negative effects elsewhere. This is why indicators for biodiversity are not showing progress despite there being more commitments. Many area-based protection initiatives are in place, managed by different actors. To a large extent this is included in OECMs, but also managed landscapes can have a conservation value for biodiversity. All these areas need to be included, e.g. cultural sites, geo-heritage etc. This then also includes different governance types: public, private, indigenous and local people and hybrid forms.

Indigenous and community conserved areas can increase the protected area network for comparatively little investment – this also improves connectivity and is very important for

achieving biodiversity targets, as well as other social benefits. Maybe communities themselves can register these areas – is this a future path for conservation?

The conservation world is thinking about how to scale up ambitions: a new deal for nature; 30% protection by 2030; 50 by 50; others think the whole earth needs protection. Restoration will be essential to bend the curve for biodiversity. Currently, restoration areas not under protected or conserved area definitions.

Lessons from area based approaches*.* In recent decades, the objectives and definition of conservation has changed. The concepts of sustainable use and conservation have been separated but should be united. The emphasis should now be on recognising positive actions, actions that contribute positively to biodiversity in areas where we live and work, this is beyond protected areas.

The Action Agenda can contribute to an inclusive approach to conservation, that is now often lacking. Area-based work could be an essential part of the Action Agenda. Planned and managed landscapes are very important to include (for connectivity corridors etc.). There has to be an effective conservation outcome. The Action Agenda may become a patchwork of contributions, with different levels of significance, but all are helping in some way. Simplicity is the starting point on which we can learn, refine and improve.

6. Building an online platform to deliver on the Action Agenda

In this session the functionality of the beta-version of the platform for the Action Agenda was briefly presented by the Margaret Egbula (sCBD). After this, in-depth lessons from the different platforms on climate and an overview of other platforms were presented. The discussion focused on what can be learned from earlier experiences, how to capture other commitments in the Action Agenda for nature and People.

Presentations

Lessons from the climate action agenda and link to Monitoring, Reporting and Verification, *Oscar Widerberg, IVM-VU*

A key lesson from the climate action agenda is the importance of building a momentum from bottom-up. In 2014, the Lima Paris Action Agenda was created to encourage momentum. The Nazca commitments website set up separately to capture "the commitments to climate action by companies, cities, subnational, regions, investors, and civil society organizations." Challenges to quantifying impacts include: defining clear boundaries and terminology; use of common methodologies to aggregate and assess nonstate and subnational contributions; systematically dealing with issues of overlap; estimating the likelihood of implementation; addressing data gaps; looking at potential mitigation rather than actual empirical achievements.

Lessons learned from NAZCA include: specify the goals of the platform (mobilisation of action might be different than MRV); trade-off between stringency in monitoring and reporting, and willingness to engage in the action agenda; leveraging the input of a network of data-providers and an "analytical community" (more productive and cost-efficient); the role of champions is key; expensive to implement; accountability/transparency – commitments do not necessarily translate to (fast) action.

Examples and lessons from existing online platforms, Naomi Kingston, WCMC

Professional specialists will be required for communication and website development, as well as behavioral change to really utilise the full potential of the platform. NAZCA is the most comprehensive platform so it is a useful example from which to learn. The UNFCCC Action pledges & NDCs, and climate strikes are other good examples. The assessment of existing platforms also leads to the conclusion that duplication is not always negative as it allows for independent verification of commitments. Our research suggests that some thematic areas have less information, so this will need to be addressed. Periodic updates to the Action Agenda may also be necessary to ensure validity.

Another question which arises is whether different entry points for separate themes are required, and if so, how do we make this compatible? Ascertaining the target audience will in part help to answer this question, as it is possible to encourage action without everything being pledged online. Key features for a good platform: clear aims, scope, scale, timelines and intended impact; designed with users in mind (both data providers, and those wanting to access the information); may need multiple access paths, different functionality; engaging/visually appealing; need to encourage and incentivise reporting; measurable with facility to log when the commitment has been actioned; trackable with accountability for commitments made; and if long-term - resource management, updates to content and functionality are needed.

Views from the workshop

On the Action Agenda platform now live, workshop participants offer some initial thoughts:
- Wording such as 'actions need to be scientifically sound and biodiversity relevant' may put some actors off. Creating a low barrier to entry will encourage more to get involved.
- Mixing policy goals and practical themes seems unlikely to work
- Identity: do we need the Action Agenda to be a separate entity with its own website?
- Parties need more time for discussion on this mechanism and the criteria
- There is confusion as to whether actors are committing to action on the post-2020 framework or existing Aichi targets
- Is there use for individuals pledging, or is it more useful for organisations?

Lessons from the climate action agenda and link to MRV? Aspects of the monitoring of the climate change regime could be applied to biodiversity, for example the Emissions Gap Report (which includes section on non-state activities). Parties have to agree on an accountability framework as part of the discussions on the post-2020 framework.

However, the action agenda is not just about the platform, but even more so about the different elements relevant for the participation of non-state actors. In climate, two high-level champions create bridges between non-state and state discussions. And on the national-level - similar initiatives to the NAZCA platform are now being created. Additionally, biodiversity regional meetings to create concrete and rapid action on the ground could be held.

7. Discussion on the way forward towards COP-15 and beyond

To draw some conclusions on the way forward, in the last session of the workshop four groups addressed the following question:
   a. What is needed for non-state actors to further engage & become part of the Action Agenda?

b. What is needed from a government-perspective on how to further the Action Agenda?
c. How can the Platform and MRV be further developed (as part of the Action Agenda)?
d. How could the Action Agenda be further developed from an area-based conservation perspective?

All groups identified necessary elements for the action agenda, short term priorities (until COP-15), medium term priorities (after COP-15) and linkages to other processes. Below an overview is provided. Together, these four groups provided different but altogether converging perspectives about the possible ways forward. This is as far the discussions during the workshop have come; they do not present a consensus view and they are here offered as input in follow-up discussions within CBD and beyond.

What is needed for non-state actors to further engage and become part of the Action Agenda?

Necessary elements for the Action Agenda
- Need for incentives for all people to join the initiative? What benefit do they get from joining?
- Consider differentiated approaches / insights for citizens / NGOs / Cities & Regions (sub-national) / Business & Sectors. For NGOs, consider both development & environmental NGOs with adjusted narratives.
- Need to set: ambition/goals/targets (What)
- Pledge/commitment and actions to make it happen (How)
- Actions have to relate to biodiversity ("all shades of green") with different sectors and thematic.
- Individuals need to be able to join or support initiatives created by any intermediary organisation to create/support a movement.

Short-term
- Find champions (people/groups) able to take the leadership national & global
- Build collaboration with Climate and Ocean action agendas
- Frame and develop different narrative, building on what is happening in cities, business etc.
- Showcase strong inspiring examples for each type of audience (Deltaplan for biodiversity in the Netherlands / Act4Nature in France...)
- Start at the National level to engage discussions and use the Regional Conservation Fora of IUCN to mobilize members in all countries
- Engage with coalitions working on sustainability but not (yet) on biodiversity (as identified in the IUCN project) able to mobilize their partners and members
- Priority for the agenda of the CBD: develop roadmap for non-state actors with milestones for each CBD meeting

Medium-term
- Support from Secretariat for developing countries
- Action agenda should be a core element of the post-2020 framework
- Non-state actors becoming part of the working procedures of the CBD (Equally important for both CSOs and Businesses to have more meaningful roles).
- Procedures for this could include: stock taking, evaluation
- High-level business events could be attended by Ministers

Linking to other processes
- Activities as highlighted in the presentations of the WEF, natural capital Coalition and ICLEI

What is needed from a government-perspective to further the Action Agenda?

Necessary elements for the Action Agenda
- It is helpful to make a distinction between pre- and post-2020 pledges. Before 2020 any pledge that contributes to biodiversity is good, little criteria are necessary. After 2020 we need to make sure that the pledges match certain criteria and that there is a follow up mechanism.
- Governments need to convene, inspire, motivate, invest in local level

Short-term
- It is urgent that parties organize multiple events on the national level, to stimulate the development of pledges. This process should start now, in order to breathe life in the action agenda. These events should be targeted at diverse networks and include strong communication and outreach. Governments should consider to invest in such events.
- There is still a lot to discuss on the Action Agenda and on biodiversity commitments of both non-state actors and states. Governments would like to have a say in the goals, form and promotion/outreach of the Action Agenda and the link to similar instruments. It should be proposed to put the item on the agenda of the CBD-OEWG in August-September, to give parties negotiating time to prepare for 2020.
- Organising side events at OEWG to inspire others
- Activity – stream of activities worldwide (in conjunction with Egypt and China)

Medium-term
- Front-running governments could help and stimulate others to take the lead and come in an action modus. This could help to generate a stream of international activities that make the action-agenda work. Regional meetings and meetings for certain sectors, and large scale science meetings should be put on the time line. It should be made sure that the manpower to do so is in place.
- After 2020 be more precise with commitments (a 2-stage process)
- A biodiversity action network between NGO's is necessary. Governments could play a role in making the right connections at international scale. Biodiversity action network organised by Chinese NGOs – how can we help?

Linking to other processes
- Boosting mainstreaming – sector-wise, teams, champions. Involving developing countries
- Learning from Talanoa dialogue as an example of how meaningful inclusion of non-state actors in post-2020 framework could be achieved – how can we reach climate goals including non-state actors?

How can the platform and MRV be further developed?

Necessary elements for the Action Agenda
- Mobilising additional actions – the CBD may need to move towards a meta-platform
- Building links and partnerships with others to support development
- Tying the platform to 3 objectives awareness raising, inspire nature-based solution, cooperative solutions
- Creating a multipurpose platform to show case what is going on for both indivduals and networks & organisations as well as repository and interaction functions
- Initially, required reporting should not be stringent
- Linking further development to ongoing events
- Involvement of social media

- Get more clarity about the role/goal of platform as part of the broader agenda
- 'Let all flowers bloom' approach
- Use upcoming events (eg Climate Summit Sept 2019) strategically to boost the action agenda for nature and people
- Connecting with other platforms to build critical mass and support
- Developing local language versions
- Enabling viral campaigns and 'challenges', using the Fridays for Future and other campaigns
- Sign up needs to be brought to the 21st century – hashtags, social media

Medium-term
- Moving from quantity to quality - A more targeted and structured approach
- Creating incentives for cities and regions to join
- Develop updating mechanisms e.g. on a yearly basis
- Develop nudging mechanisms for reporting and accountability
- Creating ideal types of action for individuals to sign up easily

Linking to other processes
- The reporting criteria will need to be developed in conjunction with other sectors - All groups should work together as distinctions are arbitrary
- Will this platform be fed or will this platform feed other platforms, or a bit of both?
- The CBD's capacity problem could be ameliorated by using the soft power of the UN reputation to remind on MRV

How could the Action Agenda be further developed from an area-based conservation perspective?

Necessary elements for the Action Agenda
- Part of the agenda (and portal) should be a meta-platform that brings together different commitment portals and sources of information on area-based conservation status and efforts
- That meta-platform should help guide new actors with new commitments to find the commitment portal that best suits their objectives
- The platform would be constructed around the distinction between protected areas, conserved areas/OECMs, elsewhere), and should have a shared narrative around these categories and their significance
- The platform, as part of the Action Agenda, is part of the CBD process, Parties may want to decide on where it should sit, but UNEP-WCMC could be a candidate for this.

Short-term
- Side-event could be hosted at the Open-ended Working Group
- Pull together the most relevant commitment portals, and use their data/ input to populate the Action Agenda (area based)
- Pay attention to restoration as a theme that will significantly grow in importance notably in the context of climate change (natural climate solutions)
- Communicate clearly that reporting and verification is essential and will be a requirement; existing portals with reporting requirements will of course continue to do so.
- Develop a lazy persons guide to area based conservation, as a communication tool to get commitments flowing in
- On top of existing commitments, develop new input on the basis of pilots:
  - African Model Forest Network (community-based work in Congo basin)
  - Finnish work on urban biodiversity
  - Indonesia programme on Critical Ecosystems
  - Dutch national commitment inventory by IUCN NL

Medium-term
- Further develop and implement metric and methodology for MVR to ensure long-term commitment will be delivered
- Linking commitments (commitment categories) with existing and new incentive schemes to help realise ambitions
- Consolidation/ maturation of the meta-platform will be needed, including identification of gaps (do we cover all sorts of needed commitments?)

Linking to other processes
- Follow further development of Nazca process, especially on MRV.
- Green list – best of class measure of commitments
- EU preparation is highly relevant, how can EU contribute to this area-based approach?

In the closing discussion, various action points were mentioned that participants will take home from the meeting. Time is of the essence, and in the run up to COP-15, support must be galvanised.

Annex 1 programme

09:00 Coffee

09:30 Start of meeting

Chair: Marcel Kok, PBL

- Welcome by Mr. Lejo van der Heiden, Management-team, Directorate Nature, Fisheries and Rural areas at the Netherlands Ministry of Agriculture, Nature and Food
- Introduction to objectives of the meeting
- Short round of introductions

10:00 Sharing perspectives on the Action Agenda

- View from the Secretariat, by Margaret Egbula, secretariat CBD
- Policy & stakeholder perspectives – participants are invited to share their views and current discussion within their constituency on the Action Agenda (short contributions).

11:00 Coffee break

11:30 The action agenda towards, and as part of, the post-2020 framework

Chair: Astrid Hilgers, Ministry of LNV

- Structuring the action agenda for biodiversity and linking it with post-2020 negotiations and implementation, by Aleksandar Rankovic and Matthieu Wemaere, IDDRI
- The action agenda as part of the post-2020 Global Biodiversity Framework, by Marcel Kok, PBL
- *Discussion* of Action Agenda framework, its political importance and functions towards 2020 and beyond, the link to national biodiversity commitments, the connections to the post-2020 framework (NBSAPs, NR, accountability, ratcheting mechanism), potential to link to other action agenda's (in for example Oceans, Climate, SDGs).

12:45 Lunch

13:45 Mapping the emerging international non-state action landscape

Chair: Naomi Kingston, WCMC

- Towards a Global Biodiversity Action Agenda: Mapping biodiversity-related governance initiatives by Philipp Pattberg, IVM/VU
- Leveraging coalitions to achieve global biodiversity goals, by Florence Curet, IUCN-International
- *Discussion* of lessons that can be drawn from the mapping from the international non-state action landscape, the thematic and geographical distribution of current initiatives, possible gaps and opportunities this provides for the Action Agenda. ,

15:15 Tea break

15:45 Making the action agenda reality

Chair: Aleksandar Rankovic

- View from the World Economic Forum, Akanksha Khatri, World economic Forum (by Skype)
- A business for nature coalition, Martin Lok, Natural Capital Coalition
- A cities and regional perspective on the Action Agenda, Alice Reil, ICLEI (by skype)
- Joining forces: the View from the European Commission, Karin Zaunberger, European Commission
- WWF views on the action agenda, Maelle Pelisson, WWF-UK
- *Discussion* on what from a stakeholder perspective is needed to make (area-based and non-area-based) commitments as contributions to the action agenda (as

organizations, as non-state actor groups / coalitions), what are the expectations regarding the action agenda, under what conditions would commitments be made?

17:30 Close of the day

Friday, April 12 2019
09:00 Coffee
09:30 Tracking commitments for the Action Agenda – lessons learned from Area-based conservation
Chair: Aleksandar Rankovic
- Area-based conservation measures - state of knowledge & tracking global commitments, Naomi Kingston, WCMC
- Lessons from the Verified Conservation Area approach-initiative, Frank Vorhies (VCA/Earthmind)
- *Discussion*

11:00 Coffee
11:30 Building an online Platform to deliver on AA
Chair: Philipp Pattberg
- The Action Agenda online portal – Beta version, by Margaret Egbula, secretariat CBD
- Lessons from the climate action agenda and link to Monitoring, Reporting and Verification, Oscar Widerberg, IVM-VU
- Presentation on examples and lessons from existing online platforms, Naomi Kingston, WCMC
- *Discussion* on setting the narrative in order to engage users, scope, aims and objectives of the online platform, potential users both for adding information and using the information, identification on what are the quick wins (e.g area-based commitments)

12:45 Lunch

13:45 Discussion on the way forward towards COP-15 and beyond
Chair: Astrid Hilgers en Marcel kok
- How to mobilize and galvanize efforts to show a groundswell of action?
- How to mobilize non-state actors to provide data to the online platform ?
- How to track progress and turning commitments into reality – look at other examples?
- How to link to other Action Agenda's
- Timeframe and milestones for the AA to COP15
- Is there a pilot on the plane? (Egypt? China? SCBD? Who else to do the job?)
- Communications and fundraising

15:45 Wrap up and next steps
16:00 Close of the meeting

Annex 2 participants-list

1. Karin Zaunberger — European Commission
2. Hugo Rivera-Mendoza — Expertise France
3. Marina Weissenberg — Finland
4. Benoit Briand — France
5. Alice Reil — ICLEI (by skype)
6. Aleksandar Rankovic — IDDRI, Paris
7. Matthieu Wemaere — IDDRI, Paris
8. Tirza Molegraaf — IPO (representing provinces in NL)
9. Florence Curet — IUCN, Gland
10. Philippe Puydarrieux — IUCN, Gland
11. Henk Simons — IUCN NL
12. Carl Königel/Marco Keijzer — IUCN NL
13. Philipp Pattberg — IVM/VU, Amsterdam
14. Oscar Widerberg — IVM/VU, Amsterdam
15. Kate Negacz — IVM/VU, Amsterdam
16. Cebuan Bliss — IVM/VU, Amsterdam (rapporteur)
17. Lejo van der Heiden — Ministry of Agriculture, Nature and Food, NL
18. Astrid Hilgers — Ministry of Agriculture, Nature and Food, NL
19. Rob Hendriks — Ministry of Agriculture, Nature and Food, NL
20. Hayo Haanstra — Ministry of Agriculture, Nature and Food, NL
21. Matthias Huynink — Ministry of Agriculture, Nature and Food, NL
22. Arthur Eijs — Ministry of Infrastructure and Watermanagement, NL
23. Erik Verhallen — Ministry of Infrastructure and Watermanagement, NL
24. Martin Lok — Natural Capital Coalition
25. Marcel Kok — PBL, The Hague
26. Mark van Oorschot — PBL, The Hague
27. Mark Roelfsema — PBL, The Hague
28. Machteld Schoolenberg — PBL, The Hague
29. Margaret Egbula — sCBD
30. Frank Vorhies — VCA/Earthmind
31. Naomi Kingston — WCMC
32. Evgeny Dmitriev — WCMC
33. Akanksha Khatri — World Economic Forum (by Skype)
34. Maelle Pelisson — WWF UK
35. Alexandra Deprez — Yale University