



Convention on
Biological Diversity



Biodiversity Law and Governance Day 2016

The Role of Law in Mainstreaming Biodiversity and Achieving the Aichi Biodiversity Targets

Proceedings

Special thanks to our world-class academic partners:

Thanks to our Mexican host institutions:



Very deepest appreciation and acknowledgements to our governmental and international partners:



Highest recognition to the world-leading international session hosts and co-hosts:



Disclaimer

The views expressed in this publication are those shared during the proceedings of the 2016 Biodiversity Law and Governance Day.

Reproduction of this document in whole or in part and in any form for educational or non-profit purposes may be made without special permission from the copyright holders, provided acknowledgment of the source is made. The partners would appreciate receiving a copy of any publication or material that uses this document as a source.

Except where otherwise noted, this work is protected under a Creative Commons Attribution Non-commercial-No Derivative Works License.



About the Biodiversity Law and Governance Initiative (BLGI)

The BLGI supports and generates knowledge sharing activities, an active community of practice, and specialised biodiversity law and governance capacity-building events and courses alongside the biannual Conferences of the Parties to the Convention on Biological Diversity. It coordinates the work of a broad biodiversity action coalition of international organizations, academic institutions, leading law associations and law firms, courts, and tribunals.

Contact Information

Centre for International Sustainable Development Law (CISDL)

McGill University Faculty of Law, Chancellor Day Hall, 3644 Peel Street

Montreal, Québec H3A 1W9, Canada

tel +1 818-685-9931 fax +1 514-398-4659

www.cisdl.org

BIODIVERSITY LAW AND GOVERNANCE DAY 2016: THE ROLE OF LAW IN MAINSTREAMING BIODIVERSITY AND ACHIEVING THE AICHI BIODIVERSITY TARGETS

Saturday, 10 December 2016 | in parallel to the CBD COP13 | Venue: Moon Palace Convention Center

Highlights

With the support of partners, through consultations, gathering of research information, engagement and partnerships with developing country institutions, Biodiversity Law and Governance Day (BLGD) 2016 held on 10 December 2016 brought together 114 participants from CBD Parties, leaders from academia, legal practice, expert institutions, intergovernmental organizations, the private sector, civil society, and indigenous peoples and local communities. Delegates gathered to learn, engage in dialogue, and share good practices, information, experiences, and lessons learned in activating law and governance to mainstream biodiversity into other economic sectors and achieve the Aichi Biodiversity Targets. Over 300 further decision-makers and institutions in developing and emerging regions of the world were engaged through online and direct communications, contributing to the success of the inaugural Biodiversity Law and Governance Day.

This engagement process, featuring a special inaugural event during the thirteenth meeting of the Conference of the Parties (COP 13) to the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD), focused on sharing experiences on mainstreaming biodiversity into legislation governing primary economic sectors, and for mainstreaming measures which cut across all sectors, including economic valuation tools and environmental assessments, which assist in assessing impacts on biodiversity and ecosystem services. The role of comprehensive biodiversity legislation in achieving the Aichi Targets was also a central issue in the discussions. A special emphasis was placed on identifying links between the Strategic Plan on Biodiversity 2011-2020 and its Aichi Biodiversity Targets, Agenda 2030 for Sustainable Development, and the Paris Agreement to the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC), and on building capacity to engage, share experiences and design partnerships for action.

After an open and transparent call for partnerships which was circulated to over 8,000 organizations and governments in developed and developing countries, the BLGD Initiative established a Programme Committee to analyze and evaluate them, and coordinate its work. Drawing on the advice and offers to share experiences that were received, with special support provided for the participation of research institutions from Africa, Asia, and Latin America, a balanced programme for the Day was developed and circulated for approval, the broader biodiversity community were invited, the logistical aspects of the event were finalized.

The results of the BLGD were presented in an Official COP13 Special Event on 12 December 2016 in the CEPA Auditorium hosted by Prof. John Knox and the session chairs/hosts, chaired by the CBD Secretariat together with CISDL, CEMDA and University of Nairobi.

The organisers would like to express our greatest thanks to the 2016 Biodiversity Law and Governance Day Programme Committee, student volunteers, and contributors.



BIODIVERSITY LAW AND GOVERNANCE DAY 2016: THE ROLE OF LAW IN MAINSTREAMING BIODIVERSITY AND ACHIEVING THE AICHI BIODIVERSITY TARGETS

SESSION SUMMARIES OF THE DELIBERATIONS & DEBATES

Welcome Opening Plenary

Chairs: Prof. Dr. Marie-Claire Cordonier Segger (Professor of Law, University of Waterloo / Senior Director & Centre for International Sustainable Development Law) & Ms. Amy Ann Fraenkel, Esq. (Director, Mainstreaming, Cooperation and Outreach Division, Secretariat of the Convention on Biological Diversity). Hosts: Prof. Jorge Cabrera (Lead Counsel for Biodiversity & Biosafety Law, CISDL / Professor, University of Costa Rica). Partners: Ms. Mette Lyngsøe Svejgaard (CBD SBSTTA National Focal Point, Swedish Environmental Protection Agency); Ms. Maria Schultz (Director of SwedBio at Stockholm Resilience Centre); Mr. Tim Scott (Policy Advisor Environment, UNDP); Mr. Kent Nnadozie (Secretary Ad-Interim, International Treaty on Plant Genetic Resources for Food and Agriculture) & Dr. Balakrishna Pisupati (Head of Programme, Law, UNEP)

After welcoming participants, the hosts explained the main objectives underlining the creation of Biodiversity Law and Governance Day, which are to discuss how law and governance mechanisms can best be used to address the main drivers of biodiversity loss, and to share national experiences on mainstreaming biodiversity into the laws governing primary economic sectors, and laws that cut across all sectors, such as economic valuation tools and environmental assessments which evaluate potential impacts on biodiversity and ecosystem services, such as clean air and water, carbon storage, and pollination.

The opening session highlighted the importance that increased actions related to mainstreaming of biodiversity both within sectors and across sectors plays in catalyzing actions on the conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity towards the implementation of the Convention on Biological Diversity and the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011–2020, the Aichi Biodiversity Targets, the biodiversity related Sustainable Development Goals, and the Paris Agreement to the Convention on Climate Change.

Biodiversity, Human Rights and the Law

Plenary Keynote Speaker: Prof. John Knox (Wake Forest University, UN Special Rapporteur on Human Rights, and Environment).

The Special Rapporteur spoke about the preparation of his thematic report on the relation between environment and human rights, which would be presented at the 34th session of the Human Rights Council. He explained that the aim of his mandate is to clarify human rights obligations relating to the environment. An emphasis in the most recent report has been given to the biodiversity related aspects of the issue, by exploring the relationship of the two and by assessing the effects of biodiversity on the enjoyment of human rights. He expressed his interest in examining the legal framework, identifying gaps, and analyzing how human rights obligations in biodiversity policies and programmes are implemented at various levels (e.g., at the national, local and municipal levels) and by different government bodies (e.g., ministries of environment, development, agriculture, mining, etc.) in practice. He was also interested in clarifying heightened obligations of States in protecting individuals and groups that are in a vulnerable situation. Finally, the Special Rapporteur argued that environment and human rights were inexplicably linked, and highlighted the importance of biodiversity mainstreaming for human rights law, and the need to defend the human rights of biodiversity defenders.

Mainstreaming Biodiversity into Agriculture and Forestry Laws

Parallel Biodiversity Law Knowledge Café 1 Speakers: Prof. Konstantia Koutouki (CISDL / Université de Montréal), Prof. Robert Kibugi (CISDL / University of Nairobi) & Dr. Sandra Moguel (CEMDA).

This Knowledge Café session hosted by CISDL and CEMDA aimed to explore two of the sectors COP13 focused on through the presentation of national and sub-national legislations which follows under the general agreement that biodiversity awareness and laws need to be mainstreamed. Given the interconnected nature of biodiversity, mainstreaming has many challenges and impacts on other rights. Some of these challenges relate to cultural rights of indigenous peoples and local communities, which were also examined. Although we are seeing a greater recognition of these rights in judicial decisions, we are not necessarily seeing the explicit expression of the rights of indigenous peoples and local communities concerning biodiversity protection in legislative initiatives. A case study from Kenya was presented, where the legal framework on this matter is fairly advanced and based in legislation. The panel indicated that Canada has little in the way of legislation that mainstreams biodiversity protection. However, it highlighted the Supreme Court of Canada has rendered several decisions that expand indigenous rights to land, hence adding another level of consent to be obtained for development projects that can impact biodiversity. Finally, the panel it discussed the Brazilian law limiting the liability of those engaged in dubious forestry practices in the past, and concluded that it should be rethought by the State.

Mainstreaming Biodiversity through Biodiversity Laws

Parallel Biodiversity Law Knowledge Café 2 Speakers: Prof. Jorge Cabrera (CISDL / UCR) & Mr. Frederic Perron-Welch (CISDL).

This Knowledge Cafe was aimed to present a recent study on comprehensive Biodiversity Laws made by CISDL researchers, including the main content, approach, advantages and disadvantages of the comprehensive biodiversity laws vis-a-vis sectoral approaches. The role of biodiversity law in implementing the Aichi Targets and achieving the objectives of the Convention (as a framework Convention) and its Protocol was discussed.

Based on different national experiences presented by the participants, the advantages and relevance of comprehensive biodiversity laws were analysed. Some interesting and successful legal experiences have been documented to prove the value of this comprehensive legal approach for the mainstreaming of biodiversity in different economic sectors. Some positive impacts of a comprehensive biodiversity law include better integration of biodiversity in other areas relevant for national development, as well as highlighting the political relevance of biodiversity. Mainstreaming the principles of the biodiversity law in other legislation (i.e. mining, fisheries) was also considered a critical achievement. An overarching biodiversity law can also provide biodiversity with a higher priority than when it is mainstreamed into sectoral laws.

However, it was also recognized that more support is required for countries to enact biodiversity laws and to make the necessary institutional and legal arrangements to provide for a coherent implementation of the laws with other existing sectoral norms (agriculture, forest, protected areas, etc).

Mainstreaming Benefits from Genetic Resources and Traditional Knowledge

Parallel Biodiversity Law Knowledge Café 3 Speakers: Dr. Andreas Drewns (ABS Initiative) & Mr. Kent Nnadozie (Secretary Ad-Interim, ITPGRFA).

This knowledge café session explored the legal and policy dimensions of benefit sharing of genetic resources and traditional knowledge. It addressed the issue not only in the framework of the CBD and its Nagoya Protocol, but also going beyond it. With participants coming from Mexico, Brazil, and Switzerland, most of them involved to some degree in national implementation of the Nagoya Protocol, as well as representatives from UNDP, the discussion focused on progress in the countries, strengths, weaknesses, and future research needs.

The panel summarized that government bodies continue to talk about communities—not with communities. Throughout the roundtable discussion, the panel raised the issue that in cases where rights to participate in national processes are formally granted, it remains unclear who represents communities in such processes: unclear mandates and unclear processes exist to identify/nominate representatives.

Discussants concluded that at the national level, sectors such as environment, agriculture, forestry, science, etc. remain in their silos, even if cooperation between sectors is required by the legislature. At the same time, the panellists cautioned the need to establish clear protocols and rules for public participation at all levels, from national to local. The panel also highlighted the need to clarify land tenure rights as a basis for making benefit-sharing a reality.

The panel concluded with a discussion of what has been learned through recent initiatives on benefit sharing governance at national and international levels.

Mainstreaming Biodiversity in European Laws

Concurrent Participatory Workshops 1 Speakers: Mr. Stefan Leiner (Head, Biodiversity Unit, European Commission); Ms. Helene Lindahl (Senior Nature Conservation Officer, Swedish EPA); Ms. Ulrika Gunnesby (Lawyer, Swedish EPA) & Mr. Gaute Voigt-Hanssen (ABS National Focal Point, Norwegian Ministry of Climate and Environment).

This session, hosted by the Swedish Environmental Protection Agency, looked at the integration of biodiversity into European legislation. The workshop participants were requested to consider the following question before attending the workshop: What is the most effective tool; mainstreaming biodiversity into the legislation governing different sectors, such as agriculture, forestry, fisheries, and tourism, or mainstreaming into legislation that cut across all sectors? The session featured a discussion of the EU Nature Directives as a starting point, which dictate a result but not the means used to get there, followed by presentations of cases and examples of laws from Sweden and Norway.

The session concluded with a discussion among participants on best examples and the challenges in national lawmaking and implementation. Ownership of the biodiversity agenda throughout different sectors was identified as necessary, as was implementation at the local level. Communicating international and national priorities to local users and sectors was identified as a priority. At the end, suggestions were made on what the participants would like to see in future CBD COP decisions in order to facilitate mainstreaming of biodiversity in national laws.

Mainstreaming Biodiversity in Human Rights Law: Why Ecosystems are a Human Rights Issue

Concurrent Participatory Workshops 2 Chair: Dr. Claudia Ituarte-Lima (researcher at Stockholm Resilience Centre and advisor at SwedBio at SRC). Speakers: Prof. Robert Kibugi (CISDL/ University of Nairobi); Mr. Harry Jonas (Lawyer and co-founder of Natural Justice) & Mr. Antoine Libert (Universidad Autonoma Metropolitana, Mexico). Intervenors: Mr. Tim Scott (Environment Policy Advisor, UNDP); Prof. John Knox (WFU, UN Special rapporteur on human rights and environment); Ms. Maria van Berlekom (Lead Policy Specialist, Environment and Climate Change, Swedish International Development Cooperation Agency—Sida); Ms. Yolanda Saito (Senior Program Coordinator, Strategic Initiatives, International Development Law Organisation) & Ms. Helene Molinier (Program Manager, Strategic Initiatives, International Development Law Organisation)

This session was hosted by the SwedBio Programme and the research project “Effective and Equitable Institutional Arrangements for Financing and Safeguarding Biodiversity”, both at the Stockholm Resilience Centre. It featured the issue of how ecosystems and human rights are closely intertwined, looking particularly at mainstreaming biodiversity with a human rights-based approach, and the need to consider the obligations of respecting, protecting, and fulfilling human rights in a context of cross-scale and unexpected socio-ecological interactions.

The session opened with an introduction by the chair, framing the issue of why ecosystems are a human rights issue. Then, catalyzing case studies on human rights and multilevel governance of ecosystems were presented, followed by group dialogues. The session culminated with presentations on the role of international organisations in connecting ecosystems, biodiversity and human rights, and strategies on how to connect distinct levels in the process of mainstreaming biodiversity with a human rights based approach. For strengthening the links between ecosystems, human rights, rule of law, and governance in the Sustainable Development Goals context, examples of both internal practices and more external facing initiatives of international organisations and development cooperation agencies were presented and discussed.

According to the presenters, while ecosystems services such as the provision of food and the pollination of crops are key for the enjoyment of human rights, the exercise of human rights is also key for the stewardship of the diversity of forms of life in land and water and of distinct ecosystems. Accountability of State and non-State actors was discussed as a means to ensure that procedural rights such as participation in decision making, access to information, and access to justice have an impact on substantive rights related to ecosystems and biodiversity such as cultural rights, right to health and right to life. In operationalising the accountability principle of the human rights based approach, cases of violence against environmental defenders, both individuals and collectives, and associated impunity in many of these cases was highlighted as a serious issue to be addressed urgently.

The panel also discussed examples of local communities in rural areas that depend directly on ecosystems for their livelihoods, and are especially vulnerable to biodiversity loss and ecosystem degradation affected by sudden and progressive global environmental changes such as those associated with climate change. Conservation initiatives have, in some instances, infringed the rights of indigenous peoples and local communities. There are many reasons for this, for example, not all conservation actors fully understand the rights of indigenous peoples and local communities, including the benefits that adopting a human right-based approach can bring for both people and ecosystems. Despite the rights of indigenous peoples being clearly defined in international law, there was until recently a lack of resources that clearly set out the rights of indigenous peoples in the context of conservation initiatives. The Conservation Standards were one of the initiatives presented to address this gap.

The panel also discussed advances within the CBD context that explicitly mention “human rights treaties”, which include the CBD voluntary guidelines for safeguards in biodiversity financing mechanisms, one of the instruments for operationalising and interpreting the CBD adopted by the Conference of the Parties in CBD-COP Decision

XII/3 on resource mobilization. Likewise, the panel discussed, from a human rights perspective, the challenges associated with scale for responding to social-ecological challenges, such as a series of atypical outbreaks of the coffee rust, an epidemic which has been associated with climate change and has affected many smallholders of shade-grown Arabica coffee throughout Latin America. It was discussed how the vision to “produce by conserving, conserve by producing” that is practiced by many small-scale households living in diverse agroforestry systems constitutes a bottom-up contribution that matches the CBD’s objectives.

There was also a recognition that further guidance is needed within the CBD context to understand and act upon the implicit and explicit connections between the CBD and human rights law and policy, and that CBD Parties and other stakeholders would benefit from such guidance. The reports of the UN Special Rapporteur on Human Rights and Environment, in particular the 2017 thematic report on biodiversity and human rights, provide key inputs that could be further discussed and elaborated within the CBD technical meetings and Conference of the Parties.

Mainstreaming Biodiversity in Mining Governance

Concurrent Participatory Workshops 3 Chair: Mr. Tim Scott (Policy Advisor Environment, UNDP). Speaker: Prof. John Knox (WFU, UN Special Rapporteur on Environment and Human Rights). Intervenors: Mr. Neville Ash (Director, UNEP WCMC); Dr. Claudia Ituarte-Lima (Researcher at Stockholm Resilience Centre and advisor at SwedBio at SRC); Dr. Dorjsuren Ariuntuya (Senior Officer, Climate Change and International Cooperation, Ministry of Environment and Tourism, Mongolia); Ms. Alexandra Fischer (Regional Advisor, artisanal gold mining in Suriname and Guyana, UNDP) & Ms. Carmen Miranda (ICCA Consortium, Bolivia).

This workshop, hosted by the UNDP and the UNEP-WCMC, focused on ways to mainstream biodiversity into the mining sector governance. While not one of the main sectors targeted by COP 13, due to its sizable environmental impact and economic relevance action is also required on the legal framework and policy aspects governing mining.

The panel posited that many countries – and the world at large – are reliant on the mining sector. Yet, the extractive industry often causes severe environmental degradation and threatens biodiversity. Extraction of mineral resources can have a transformative impact on development if it is governed properly. However, the negative environmental and social impacts of resource extraction can be significant. Environmental degradation has negative impacts on social and economic development and on sustaining peace, as conflicts around land, resources, pollution often trigger social conflicts. The negative consequences often disproportionately impact poor, marginalized and vulnerable people who often have little power and ability to influence decision-making or claim their rights. This can compound existing inequalities by infringing on other rights, such as the right to life and health for the affected people. Environmental degradation drives inequalities and vice versa in a vicious circle.

Furthermore, it was noted that often an inherent tension exists between environmental protection and short term socio-economic priorities to meet public policy objectives, such as ensuring government revenues, economic development and securing jobs. A country’s public administration, typically ministries of environment and other environmental agencies, are responsible for ensuring proper environmental regulation and enforcement of legal and regulatory frameworks to safeguard a clean and healthy environment for all. However, capacities of environmental protection agencies are often weak, and issues around lack of coordination with other agencies regulating to the mining sector are compounded by a lack of functional clarity among institutions. Institutional capacity for ensuring that procedural human rights and rule of law principles such as right to information, participation and access to justice are applied, as detailed in Principle 10 and the Bali Guidelines, need strengthening.

The panellists also noted one the reasons for unsustainable consumption and production, including through the mining sector, is because that those who are most negatively affected are also those who are least powerful to lobby and influence decision-makers. There is an imbalance of power. These inequalities help drive environmental degradation. At the same time, environmental degradation drives inequalities. If ecosystem services are degraded or access to them is denied, poverty is exacerbated in multiple dimensions as part of a vicious circle. This inability to capture the potential development benefits of extractive sectors is generally a result of failures in environmental governance; of the weak capacities of environmental protection agencies, ministries of environment, and of States more broadly, to fulfil their mandates to govern the mining sector for the benefit of their peoples.

According to the panel, a country's environmental public administration, working closely with other relevant authorities and societal actors, has a key role in defining, implementing and enforcing regulations and policies that aim to minimize biodiversity and broader environmental impacts of mining. Application and strengthening of procedural human rights and rule of law principles, such as participation in decision-making, the right to be heard, access to information and transparency, accountability and redress, are key to preventing environmental degradation and linked negative social consequences. At the same time, such human rights based approaches can help protect substantive human rights and advance multiple SDGs.

Finally, some governments and other stakeholders are taking steps to address these challenges. This includes efforts to ensure that biodiversity is protected from the negative impacts of mining, including following the mitigation hierarchy (avoidance, minimisation, mitigation and offset of impacts) and implementation of commitments of no net loss of biodiversity and linked efforts that strengthen livelihoods. Some countries are using a range of tools to measure, manage and monitor the cumulative direct and indirect impacts of the extractive sector and how they factor in the additional and competing biodiversity requirements and impacts of all other sectors using the same landscape. This work is being done through partnerships with public, private and civil society actors to address the many threats to biodiversity and local communities. Some of the tools that can be used to ensure better public and community participation, access to information, and access to justice, and in turn ensures better biodiversity and social outcomes in line with Principle 10 and the Bali Guidelines, including SEAs, the UNDP Rule of Law in Public Administration of the Mining sector (ROLPA-M) assessment, measures like the WRI Environmental Democracy Index, the UNEP-World Bank MAP-X, technical monitoring by UNEP-WCMC, and initiatives such as the Sida-funded UNDP—Swedish EPA Environmental Governance Programme.

Mainstreaming Biodiversity in Sub-National Laws—Governance challenges for ecological restoration and wildlife protection in the State of São Paulo, Brazil

Concurrent Participatory Workshops 4 Speakers: Patrícia Faga Iglecias Lemos (Professor of Law, Head of Environmental Affairs of the University of São Paulo and former Secretary for the Environment of the State of São Paulo); Dr. Rogério de Oliveira Xavier (Head, Environmental Police Department for the State of São Paulo); Mr. Rafael Bitante Fernandes (Forest restoration manager, SOS Mata Atlântica Foundation); Mr. Paulo Pianez (Director of sustainability, Carrefour Brazil); Ms. Frineia Rezende (Sustainability Manager, Reservas Votorantim); Ms. Tatiana Barreto Serra (Public Prosecutor, São Paulo); Ms. Lia Helena Monteiro de Lima Demange (Researcher, Office of Environmental Affairs of the University of São Paulo) & Cristina Yuri Vidal (PhD candidate, University of Campinas).

This session, hosted by the University of São Paulo and featuring speakers from Brazilian civil society, academic, government, and the private sector, focused on mainstreaming biodiversity in sub-national laws, namely those of the State of São Paulo in Brazil.

The panellists suggested that universities around the world can contribute to environmental conservation by establishing policies that incorporate conservation of green areas in campuses, monitoring and protection of wildlife, and promotion of environmental education through participation in the elaboration and evaluation of public policies.

At the same time, the panellists also discussed how academic research on environmental restoration and conservation is an important contributor to policy making in order to ensure that adopted restoration methods are cost effective and able to promote connectivity among forest remnants. Academic research on such subjects is crucial to provide a scientific foundation for conservation rules, thereby, addressing drawbacks of environmental regulation, as observed during the enactment of the Brazilian Forest Code.

At the same time, a university can stand against cultural events and other practices that submit animals to cruel acts by preparing technical studies that identify animals suffering, by these means, subsidizing judicial claims for the recognition of the rights of animals. Another related discussion focused on how the exchange of experiences between government officials and academics on how wild animals are trafficked is relevant for improving oversight methods with the use of new technologies.

Finally, the presenters addressed how the careful management of the supply chain can ensure sustainable production and prevent deforestation and environmental degradation by economic sectors such as cattle breeding, palm oil, paper, and timber.

Experts Closing Plenary and Closing Ceremony

Speakers: Prof. Marie-Claire Cordonier Segger (CISDL / University of Waterloo); Dr. Sandra Moguel (CEMDA); Mr. Tim Scott (Policy Advisor Environment, UNDP); Dr. Claudia Ituarte-Lima (Researcher at Stockholm Resilience Centre and advisor at SwedBio at SRC); Ms. Maria Schultz (Director of SwedBio at Stockholm Resilience Centre); Mr. Stefan Leiner (Head, Biodiversity Unit, European Commission); Prof. Patrícia Faga Iglecias Lemos (Professor of Law, Head of Environmental Affairs, University of São Paulo / former Environment Secretary, State of São Paulo); Prof. Jorge Cabrera (CISDL/UCR), Mr. Gaute Voigt-Hanssen (ABS National Focal Point, Norwegian Ministry of Climate and Environment) & Mr. Neville Ash (Director, UNEP WCMC). Closing: Miss Allison Lievano-Gomez (LAC), Master Jona David (NA/EU) & Miss Ying-Xuan Lai (Asia), UNESCO Voices of Future Generations Children's Initiative.

In this plenary, the chairs presented the reports of their session and were joined by invited discussants. Since most of the sessions were concurrent, it provided an opportunity for all the participants to be briefed on what was discussed throughout the Day in all the rooms. Educators, researchers, and policy-makers came together to discuss ways to move forward based on the lessons learned during the inaugural Biodiversity Law and Governance Day. The chairs of each session summarized the findings and contributions of each session, identifying key elements of a future legal research, subsequent policy and reform agenda to support national and international efforts towards mainstreaming biodiversity, followed by a stimulating public debate and enhancing the understanding of the problems and possible solutions.

The day concluded with a presentation by three Child Authors from the UNESCO Voices of Future Generations Children's Initiative. Each child, representing a different UN region, has written books on the SDGs. In their presentation, they pointed out the aspects of their books related to biodiversity, and the importance of the issue for children around the world. They expressed their hopes for the future of biodiversity and the SDGs, children's rights and voices of future generations. The presentation was followed by the launch of the UNESCO—Voices of Future Generations film on the Convention on the Rights of the Child and the Sustainable Development Goals.

BIODIVERSITY LAW AND GOVERNANCE DAY 2016: THE ROLE OF LAW IN MAINSTREAMING BIODIVERSITY AND ACHIEVING THE AICHI BIODIVERSITY TARGETS

OVERVIEW OF THE OUTCOMES

BLGD 2016 and its associated Special Event featuring the UN Special Rapporteur on Environment and Human Rights, Prof. John Knox, during COP 13 provided fora for dialogue beyond the negotiations context. This summary report links the results of Biodiversity Law and Governance Day to the COP discussions, highlighting new opportunities for cooperation to strengthen biodiversity law and governance capacity, with resulting benefits for transparency and compliance. The events have helped to build an informed and engaged biodiversity community of practice.

The BLGI will also continue hosting dialogues and events alongside the CBD processes and beyond in the intersession period until COP 14 in 2018..