

NOTES: Open Space session, 3 July 2019

Session 1: Connectivity

Amy Fraenkel, Acting Executive Secretary, Convention on Migratory Species

Fernando Spina, ISPRA, Chair of CMS Scientific Council

1. Topic for exchange: **Connectivity. Participants were asked what drew them to this group discussion – what was the issue around connectivity that they thought was important for the post-2020 framework?**
2. Basic overview of participants: **Approximately 30 participants, mostly parties, covering a diverse array of regions. (Full list is appended).**
3. How does this help us to identify which changes need to happen?

Key messages:

-Connectivity is an essential element that needs to be much more effectively included in the post 2020 biodiversity framework.

-Participants see the need to elevate this issue in the future discussions towards a new framework.

-Some countries called for a stand-alone target on connectivity in the new framework, since it relates to many aspects of biodiversity conservation, use and genetic resources – not just Aichi Target 11, and not just protected areas. One participant noted that connectivity could provide a useful alternative to an increased (e.g., 50%) protected area target.

-Nationally, many countries see the importance of connectivity for planning a more holistic, scientifically grounded network of area-based measures.

-Connectivity often implies the need for transboundary, regional or international cooperation – something that is also missing from the current biodiversity framework and that needs to be included.

-Some noted that there are some good tools and guidelines that exist, including guidelines on SEA and EIA, infrastructure, and others, but that these needed to be implemented fully.

-It is important to consider ways to accommodate human livelihoods (e.g., fishing) and connectivity of biodiversity/species.

-Many noted that connectivity can also provide a means around which the various biodiversity conventions and other conventions can come together. If a migratory species encounters chemicals on its path, the chemicals conventions have a role. If it encounters a wetlands area, Ramsar has a role. If it is in a city, urban planners need to play a role.

-Various ongoing efforts around this issue were discussed, and next steps on furthering this issue were discussed, including a workshop this fall.

Attendees to the Session 6 discussion on connectivity, Wednesday July 3d 2019, 15.30

1. Norwegian Environmental Agency
2. FAO, Forestry sector
3. Ministry Environment Romania (2 people)
4. Government Cote d'Ivoire national representative in IPBES
5. Antigua Barbuda Government
6. BirdLife International
7. Turkmenistan Ministry Environment, national representative in CBD SUBBSTA
8. South Africa Ministry Environment
9. Botswana National Environmental Authority
10. The Nature Conservancy
11. Fauna & Flora
12. Austria Ministry of Environment
13. Spain Ministry of Ecological transition
14. Namibia, national NBSAP representative
15. Egypt, Ministry of Environment
16. Sweden Ministry Environment, IPBES representative
17. France Ministry of Ecology
18. USA Environmental Agency
19. Croatia Ministry of Biodiversity
20. Slovenia Ministry Environment
21. Saudi Environmental Authority
22. Japan Ministry Environment
23. CMS
24. Fernando Spina, Institute for Environmental Protection and Research, Rome (ISPRA), and chair of the CMS Scientific Council

30 people, 24 countries/institutions