

CONTRIBUTIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS by non-governmental organizations of Latin America and the Caribbean to the post 2020 global biodiversity framework



CONTENT

<u>INTRODUCTION</u>	03
<u>WORKSHOP ORGANIZATION</u>	03
<u>MISSION</u>	04
<u>GUIDING PRINCIPLES</u>	05
 <u>GENERAL AREAS OF DISCUSSION</u>	 07
<u>1. Loss of habitat, biodiversity and ecosystemic services</u>	07
<u>2. Integration of biodiversity into other sectors</u>	08
<u>3. Resource mobilization and financing</u>	08
<u>4. Human rights approach to conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity</u>	09
<u>5. Implementation and compliance mechanism</u>	10
<u>6. Communication, awareness-raising and information</u>	11
 <u>OTHER ISSUES</u>	 13
<u>Technological arrangements</u>	13
 <u>ANNEX</u>	 14
<u>List of participants</u>	14

INTRODUCTION

Fundación Ambiente y Recursos Naturales (FARN) together with the CBD Alliance (CBDA), thanks to the support provided by DOB Ecology (“Humedales sin Fronteras/Wetlands without Borders” Programme), the IUCN National Committee of The Netherlands (International Union for the Conservation of Nature) and the Pew Charitable Trusts, convened the workshop “Contributions by non-governmental organizations of Latin America and the Caribbean to the post-2020 global biodiversity framework”. This workshop took place at Lafayette Hotel in the city of Buenos Aires, Argentina, on April 23rd and 24th 2019.

The workshop’s objective was to provide concrete contributions and recommendations to the State Parties of the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD) regarding the consultation process on the post- 2020 global biodiversity framework to be adopted at the 15° Conference of the Parties (COP).

Prior to actually meeting at Argentina’s capital, there was a pre-workshop stage. Firstly, an on-line questionnaire was drafted to be filled out by the organizations involved and to be used as a conceptual and practical framework for the workshop. It approached the priority issues to be discussed and surveyed points of view, contributions, suggestions and observations. Several reference documents and context material regarding CBD, its agenda and related processes were shared. In turn, on April 15th an informative webinar on the Convention and the post 2020 process was held.

WORKSHOP ORGANIZATION

Representatives of 12 countries in the region took part in the workshop (Paraguay, Brazil, Bolivia, Guatemala, Uruguay, Costa Rica, Ecuador, Peru, Chile, Panama, Mexico and Argentina). They came from 31 diverse non-governmental organizations (NGO) that work on issues related to the CBD’s agenda.

The event’s dynamic involved working around thematic modules, holding discussions in groups at first, followed by a plenary in which groups shared the contents of their exchange. The opening of the workshop took place on Tuesday, April 23rd, and it was in charge of Ana Di Pangracio, FARN Deputy Director. After that, Gadir Lavadenz, with CBDA, shared an overview of CBD’s processes. In the first module, the results of the online questionnaire were presented and strategic information was highlighted. After that, the strategic role of organizations as agents of environmental transformation was discussed, following an activity in which the SWOT (Strengths, Weaknesses, Opportunities and Threats) matrix was used to portray the predominant situation of the biodiversity agenda. This activity was complemented by another one which consisted in Thinking (conceptually), Feeling (emotionally) and Doing (Action) in relation with the work at individual level and the work as a network.

After that, work was carried out following a number of large areas of discussion prioritized by the group work dynamic. The group members regularly changed so as to generate exchanges among different actors and diversify the approaches throughout every debate. Every thematic discussion was guided through questions that had been prepared before by the organizers, and in every working table there was a member of the organization and/or a facilitator to sort doubts and guide the work around the CBD framework.

Discussions on large thematic areas concluded on the second day of the workshop in the morning, on Wednesday April 24th. Later, groups shared experiences or practices related to CBD framework that could be replicated/escalated, to then turn into the mission and guiding principles of a post

2020 global biodiversity framework. The workshop concluded with the creation of an action plan by the NGO present thinking about the post-workshop and reflections on what had happened over these two days.

Below there is a detail of the key elements discussed, proposals and recommendations made around the mission, guiding principles and six large areas of discussion identified by the region for the post-2020 global biodiversity framework. Besides, it is requested that these areas of discussion have corresponding thematic working groups within the adoption process of the post 2020 framework.

MISSION

Decision 14/30 adopted during COP 14 in Egypt establishes that the post-2020 global biodiversity framework must go hand in hand with an inspiring and motivational mission for 2030. During the workshop, by sharing the 2011-2020 Strategic Plan mission, the organizations involved in the workshop showed great concern about the current plan's level of progress and biodiversity's current situation. Next, there is a description of visions regarding these issues and input to be taken into account.

Many participants who for many years have been working passionately and on a daily basis on biodiversity, environment and other issues intrinsically related to them were outraged at the fact that after 25 years of the entry into force of CBD its goals have not been reached and biodiversity destruction is deepening.

The crisis is very serious, the way in which people are sweeping natural resources is atrocious, to the point of infringing the rights of people and communities. Latin America and the Caribbean is a region where some of the most diverse countries in the world can be found. There is, therefore, pain caused by the loss and degradation of their natural and cultural heritage, and in general, by the destruction of the environment and the lack of protection of biodiversity at global level. The future is being destroyed.

We are part of a whole, including the environment and nature. Not only is nature defended, but life itself. Humanity's survival and everyone's well-being relies on biodiversity; a well-being that cannot be measured only from an economic perspective. An ecocentric narrative should be pursued and the antropocentric narrative should be abandoned.

It was highlighted that there is greater awareness among people about the importance of taking care of biodiversity and the environment; that there is plenty of awareness work with children and young people in which it is necessary to continue focusing, given that they are present and future, and they are already promoting new consumption habits.

Although there is concern about the lack of progress over the past few years and the fact that CBD's mission is still far away, there was constructive criticism at the workshop. The relevance of multilateralism was highlighted. However, it was pointed out that this does not conflict with the fact that CBD should grant responsibility to every State Party to avoid "it belongs to everyone and nobody takes responsibility". Local perspectives should be better served, and general strategies should be adapted to every region by matching agendas so that the Convention does not become an empty box. In this regard, governance from the civil society becomes necessary in the territories fighting against interests' co-optation at the States.

Many positive aspects regarding CBD were brought up. It was acknowledged that the situation would be far worse without the Convention, but progress has not been proportional to the advance-

ment of threats. There is an urgent need to keep working tirelessly and to take the mission into practice. It was suggested that CBD should “have more teeth” to enforce compliance with the targets.

Besides, it was pointed out that with urgency also comes an opportunity, and that includes our region. Organizations, people and communities have shown that there are different ways of doing things in the territories, in harmony with nature. There are many practices that take care of the environment and that can be escalated.

There was a call to work more among Parties for the conservation of shared biomes. A narrowed vision (“garden vision”) should be left aside, to be replaced by a holistic view. The importance of working through alliances was underscored, work should be done in a coordinated way in order to stop working in isolation. Work should be crossborder, multidimensional and in cooperation, which entails a learning process.

Implementation of the CBD should be reconsidered and improved significantly. Parties must take up responsibility, take on the political decision of saving biodiversity through appropriate and effective actions. Double standards must be done away with. One thing is what is said to be done in national reports describing the progress in complying with CBD’s goals, and another thing is what is actually done.

CBD offers a political arena on which to raise one’s voice to claim for the progress needed to actually protect biodiversity by innovating and raising issues that are not on the agenda. The role of civil society organizations in this regard is very important. Along these lines, concern was shown about the fact that corporate power keeps co-opting several areas, and that the civic area is shrinking. CBD must make sure that this does not happen within its framework, and it must continue promoting a greater involvement of civil society.

Deep concern was shown at the ever-growing risks for people and communities which put themselves on the line and risk their lives to defend biodiversity. In Latin America and the Caribbean people die defending biodiversity, and many others suffer various attacks and hostilities about which there is no record. This has to end.

GUIDING PRINCIPLES

The following guiding principles have been pointed out, without any specific order of precedence, as the necessary ones for a post-2020 global biodiversity framework:

- Having a planetary, integral vision;
- Respecting all life, being ecocentric rather than antropocentric;
- Being inclusive;
- Have empathy;
- Applying a precautionary and non-regression approach;
- Focus on work and actions with young people (intergenerationality principle);
- Approaching underlying structural causes of biodiversity loss that can be pointed out clearly (global inequity, lack of control over corporative power and transnational corpo-

rations' activities, the impact of industrial production and consumption economies based on fossil fuels, etc.;

- Political commitment;
- Being transparent;
- Providing participation methods that involve a territorial rationale;
- Guaranteeing access to reliable information, that is easy to understand and time and evaluation sensitive and that allows for informed participation;
- Articulating with other sectors and promote changes in consumption habits;
- Strengthened articulation with other biodiversity-related conventions and processes such as the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs);
- Not allowing green make-up nor nature financialization;
- Stopping genetic resources appropriation, ensuring fair and equitable sharing;
- Applying a human rights approach to conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity;
- Respecting and protecting indigenous peoples and local communities' rights, including their right to consultation and free, prior and informed consent;
- Respecting and protecting land ownership rights and safe and equal access to land and territories;
- Respecting and protecting traditional knowledge and ancestral wisdom;
- Integrating a gender equality perspective;
- Recognizing, including and protecting people and communities that defend the environment and human rights;
- Integrating different approaches and cosmovisions such as the nature's rights approach;
- Developing empathic, clear and accessible communication;
- Measurable and realistic goals, with simple criteria and indicators that allows them to be put into practice and owned by Parties;
- Unequivocal concepts and operative definitions free of vagueness, ambiguity or multiple meanings in order to avoid terminological confusions;
- Applying a systemic approach;
- Rejecting technological solutions that keep us away from deep structural changes and that present new threats to the environment and the peoples of the world;
- Ensuring benefits for all people by taking into account the well-being of humanity as well as the well-being of other forms of life.

GENERAL AREAS OF DISCUSSION

1. Loss of habitat, biodiversity and ecosystemic services

Deforestation and destruction of other ecosystems due to the expansion of the agricultural frontier and urbanization, large-scale mining and energy projects, agrotoxics, industrial pollution must be stopped at once; including invasive exotic species (prevention, control and eradication).

Every ecosystem's and territory's carrying capacity must be respected, as well as their aptitude for use, which should constitute a fundamental criterion in decision-making processes. The environmental territorial planning is a useful tool in this regard.

CBD must make greater efforts to support agroecology and family farming, which are the foundations of food safety and sovereignty of the peoples.

Parties should take immediate and concrete actions to change consumption logics, especially in developed countries but also in urban areas where the greatest demand for resources is generated.

Indigenous peoples and local communities are biodiversity custodians, therefore, respecting their rights is directly related to the protection of biodiversity. Territory management by local communities and indigenous peoples must be recognized and respected, since it is a key part of self-determination. Also, ancestral knowledge and wisdom must be respected and incorporated.

The loss of habitat and biodiversity, whether directly or indirectly, threatens and violates individual, collective and diffuse human rights. CBD must see to this fact and contribute to preventing these infringements of rights.

In this regard, independent actors should be involved by means of, for instance, the creation of an observatory or committee that develops indexes of and monitors the true causes of biodiversity loss, including corporate power and consumption habit and logics change, especially in developed countries.

It is recommended to significantly increase the number of marine protected areas on the next strategic plan. However, emphasis must be laid on managing these areas and allocating resources properly for their comprehensive management. The non-regression principle must also be applied to avoid setbacks in terms of protected areas (reductions, loss of status, etc.) as well as in general to CBD's decisions and processes.

It is acknowledged that thanks to the Convention, there have been break-throughs in the creation of marine protected areas. However, greater emphasis should be laid on oceans and seas, since the negative impacts they are subject to exceed protection, conservation or sustainable use measures by far. The number and percentage of marine protected areas must be increased by 2030, including their creation on the high seas.

Parties have to develop a concrete action plan and roadmap to reduce threats to coral reef ecosystems -ecosystems highly vulnerable to climate change- taking into account the little progress in the Aichi Target 10. The same concern was expressed about the Andean glacial and periglacial areas, declining in the region due to global warming.

SBSTTA and CBD in general are recommended to conduct a specific evaluation of Aichi Target 5, including aspects related to such target which are mentioned in this document.

In order to avoid biodiversity loss and its consequences, the goals set forth must be complied with. To do this, there must be compliance and pressure mechanisms involving a broad range of actors.

2. Integration of biodiversity into other sectors

It is recommended to analyze and take action to evaluate the impacts of the incorporation of aspects related to biodiversity in the financial sector. Extra care should be given to avoid falling into nature's monetization or financialization through schemes that do not imply true structural changes. The integration of biodiversity cannot be used as a green makeup strategy, its integration is to respect it. Therefore, extractive activities such as mining or those related to oil should be prohibited and regulated in great detail because they are not sustainable.

Allowing and establishing "sacrifice zones", areas that can be sacrificed tradewise cannot be admitted since they are considered unproductive at an economic level, without caring for their ecosystem services or the biodiversity that inhabits the area and depends on it. Unrestrictive use is allowed, as well as the area's non-resilience. The encroachment of protected areas and zones which are rich in biodiversity cannot be allowed.

The new strategic plan needs to make greater emphasis on conservation's local and ecosystem planning as well as on the role and contribution of indigenous peoples and local communities.

Environmental Impact Assessments should no longer be pollution and destruction permit. They should be assessed, and this and other complementary tools should be better developed.

3. Resource mobilization and financing

Parties should be clear and transparent by reporting their internal budget for harmful incentives as well as the budget aimed at protecting biodiversity; this budget allocation should be reported to CBD. The incorporation of clear legislation on these matters must be promoted.

Every Party should allocate at least 1 % of their Gross Domestic Product (GDP) to biodiversity; and costs of biodiversity loss should be included in the GDP calculations.

There are, in the region, regional funds which support conservation projects and the sustainable use of biodiversity that should be taken up as examples.

Mechanisms that allow access to resources by the civil society should be implemented. Young people, women, vulnerable groups, indigenous peoples and local communities should be included. There should be more transparency and accountability for support to comply with clear objectives.

On the other hand, many times Parties find it hard to have access to large scale projects due to the technical difficulties involved. Therefore, smaller funds should be made available for local projects.

The CBD should call the World Bank, as well as all other international financial institutions, to increase the strength of their environmental safeguards or to adopt them if they are lacking safeguards.

Taking into consideration the little progress made regarding Aichi Target 3, it is recommended that Parties present a plan with a concrete road map to eliminate harmful incentives.

Incentives to industrial and/or productive matrixes that are allies in conservation should be promoted.

It is advisable to think about possible tax and/or financial benefits for companies that comply with the conservation of the environment and with the commitments taken up in the CBD framework. Options should be analyzed, such as the creation of specific taxes for sectors and industries that have an impact on biodiversity and the environment.

A restoration fund for the damage caused, which is different to compensation, should be created. In addition, truly dissuasive fines should be applied to prevent environmental damage.

It is imperative to change the approach of investment strategies towards different sectors such as the energy area. In this regard, classical concepts to measure development and well-being such as the GDP need to be modified, since they do not include the health sector nor the quality of the food that is produced and consumed. It is imperative to abandon these schemes and to incorporate biodiversity's different values, many of which do not have an economic valuation.

4. Human rights approach to conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity

CBD must make greater efforts to strengthen territories legally. Some governments are undermining rights that have already been conquered. In several countries, free, prior and informed consent is either manipulated or ignored; protected areas are entrenched in search for resource exploitation and to build huge projects aimed at satisfying an overconsumption model rather than at reducing poverty gaps.

There is strong criminalization of the protest, life risk, and there are mobs that take ownership of the territories affecting biodiversity. The vulnerability and risk of park rangers, protectors of territories, indigenous peoples and local communities must be recognized and effectively addressed. CBD should speak about this; it should deal with this issue.

It is recommended to take the Escazú Agreement on Access to Information, Public Participation and Access to Justice in Environmental Issues in Latin America and the Caribbean as a concrete regional contribution to progress on this issue in the CBD framework and to make direct reference to it at the substantiation of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework, given that it is a distinctive contribution from the region.

CBD needs to make efforts to incorporate mechanisms to strengthen human rights into the new strategic plan, including proposals such as the adoption of a new target related to the right to a healthy environment.

A human rights approach to conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity means enabling full participation environments for the civil society at the CBD process. Something to be taken into account is the incorporation of intergenerational rights, acknowledging that our current actions or lack of action have impacts that will have to be faced by future generations.

Transnational corporations should follow the highest standards in environmental protection rather than take advantage of weak legislations on this issue in developing countries, as is usually the case.

5. Implementation and compliance mechanism

National Biodiversity Strategies and Action Plans (NBSAPs)

NBSAPs must originate in the needs of the territories and communities which should be involved, from the very moment of thinking how the consultation processes should be structured. There should be updated mappings of key actors to ensure an improved, effective and broad participation.

Developing local consultations is needed, NBSAPs cannot only be made from the capital cities or behind desks. NBSAPs should have territorial support. Consultations on the creation of EPANB could incorporate technological tools to allow for e-contributions, therefore incorporating more actors and facilitating processes, but they should not replace consultations in person. In order to achieve this, resources should be transferred effectively to developing countries and institutions in charge.

In order to be able to apply compliance and punishment measures, there should be strict criteria among NBSAPs. Information should be shared among them, starting by regional processes.

NBSAPs information should be communicated in an effective manner and made accessible to the population in general and to communities. In addition, the new strategic plan should be able to be implemented from the territories through an ecosystem approach, considering that ecosystems recognize no borders.

Compliance mechanism

It is urgent to have commitment compliance mechanisms that are immediate, effective and binding. Any “voluntary” commitment Parties take up cannot leave compliance gaps but rather be in agreement with the pressing needs that arise from the current environmental crisis.

The need to quantify and define compliance indicators for each of the established targets is emphasized, with specific criteria that promote compliance and progress at the national level. Integrating these targets with other global platforms such as the Paris Agreement and the SDGs can help in terms of promoting compliance.

Implementation mechanisms of rapprochement, complaint and denunciation open not only to State Parties, but also to civil society are recommended. Strategically and in order to expedite the implementation of this kind of measures, thought could be given to mechanisms, mainly related to human rights, that may also apply sanctions in cases of non-compliance with the commitments taken up in the CBD framework.

It is recommended that the CBD may have Special Rapporteurs to draft reports on specific issues.

Other mechanisms suggested to improve commitment implementation are compliance indexes or rankings where the effort of the Parties in terms of biodiversity can be seen clearly and comparatively.

The compliance and implementation mechanism or mechanisms used must include a clear sanction element in case of non-compliance. These sanctions must be related to economic punishments or limitations on loans or financial resources due to lack of compliance.

It is suggested to incorporate in the formal process a system to take into account validation reports created by civil society corroborating the information submitted by Parties in their national reports.

CBD should promote the generation of independent committees that follow up on compliance with the strategic plan at national and sub-national levels. These committees should be elected democratically and should have a broad participation of actors. Government audits and similar oversight bodies at the national and subnational levels are another important actor in this regard.

6. Communication, awareness-raising and information

Communication and awareness-raising

It was pointed out that every communication or awareness-raising initiative should first focus on the appropriate processes, according to the needs, expectations and changes desired by the actors involved.

Communication, education and awareness has to be developed through campaigns and strategies with powerful messages that involve actors according to the local impact gradient. Awareness and access to information are not enough. These campaigns and strategies should also be aimed at influencing public policies; therefore, they should consider specific methods and tools to include the necessary interlocutors. In this sense, and given the current environmental crisis, we must clearly communicate the structural causes of the loss of biodiversity.

Developing accessible, clear, memorable and massive communication campaigns and tools is needed. The SDGs are an example of this; also working with people and groups that specialize in communication.

Local perspectives have to be taken into account for messages and to strike a balance to express the negative side of the situation as well as the progress made and the possible solutions. It is important to recognize that information and knowledge arise, are transformed and appropriated in the territory. Also, to identify spokespeople to carry messages and values including the leadership of young people and children as key actors.

There are people with other values and different feelings, and it is necessary to get to them because they may become allies in the biodiversity protection cause; to think about a way to communicate biodiversity and its issues that may reach the “neighbour”. Along these lines, biological and cultural diversity has to be embraced, considering that it is helpful for society to better understand the relevance and biodiversity, and, therefore, to reach other people who might become allies.

Bonds between biodiversity conservation and urban population well-being need to be highlighted, as well as the urban population’s responsibility of reducing its high level of consumption give it generates pressure on nature. Communication campaigns should take into account the great differences and asymmetries still present between rural and urban areas. The work in rural and urban areas is different, it entails using the methods available with a language that suits each of them.

To measure the effectiveness of the processes of communication, education and awareness, it is urgent to incorporate qualitative and quantitative indicators that allow the measurement of “soft” or non-economist emergencies. Several tools to be used were pointed out: popular platforms similar to Netflix that reach massive audiences, user-friendly and recreational participatory maps promoting the coordination of actions among actors who are in the territory. The global initiative “Nature for all” was mentioned. It aims at people falling in love with nature and it includes new actors and actions, with a focus on young people’s leadership. Cases such as con-

victions for hunting endangered species have been used to raise awareness on poaching through the media and street campaigns.

It is advisable to use existing tools, such as the CEPA kit, but also to include successful local experiences, they exist and are very many, since this work in the territory would help to multiply effects.

Parties have a great responsibility in communicating to the population the Biodiversity Targets and CBD Strategic Plan, public policies and actors related to them, as well as awareness-raising materials that are developed as from the Convention. These contents should circulate among all areas and should trickle down into other actors, mainly allies and message multipliers.

The fact that CBD and its contents are not well-known goes against its own efficiency and compliance. Therefore, the CBD internal communication has to be strengthened, and its reports and other products regionalized. A stronger role of the in supporting and advising Parties is needed. In this regard, information provided should be timely, understandable and transparent. In addition, it is advisable an effective coordination with other biodiversity-related conventions regarding communication with the purpose of creating integrated messages, striving to avoid crossed and contradictory communication.

In turn, the need to move from the environmental education concept into an eco-pedagogy concept with the objective to develop a socioenvironmental thought was brought up.

Some slogans were created, such as “knowing to love and then to care of”; “it is today, it is here and it is now”; “focus on people and not on species” and “it’s about love and not loss”.

Knowledge, innovation and traditional practices by indigenous and local communities and their customary use of biological resources

Today there is more information about the issues that put pressure on biodiversity. However, Parties should grant proper and timely resources to improve research, including networking, on natural components and populations.

Identifying that knowledge is not present only in academia. Knowledge takes place in the territories, it is produced and reproduced and it is related to biodiversity. In this regard, it is necessary to protect territorial subjects where traditional/ancestral knowledge is; that genetic resources and traditional knowledge are intrinsically linked. Also, weighing that indigenous, local and farming communities have different kinds of knowledge, interests and relations with biodiversity, and that it is necessary to articulate and come to an agreement regarding agendas and contexts.

Finally, rethinking Aichi Target 18 from a different angle is proposed: communities are not biodiversity’s employees, they conform a unit. Target 18 is an economic target, unrelated to social and environmental well-being, rather relating well-being to a material perspective. Then, there was a call to rethink the value of territory, where there is biodiversity but also there are traditional and ancestral dimensions, etc.

OTHER ISSUES

Technological arrangements

- Proposals for technological manipulation of the Earth's ecosystems, such as geo-engineering, engineering of populations and ecosystems (through gene drives and other technologies), present unacceptable risks for biological diversity and therefore, should not be deployed. CBD should incorporate the issue of synthetic biology as an issue that should be constantly reviewed in the CBD framework rather than just in their Protocols, given that synthetic biology applications, including genomic editing and gene drives, have multiple potential impacts on the three objectives of the Convention at socioeconomic level but also regarding the way in which indigenous, peasant and local communities live, which are not covered by their protocols.
- CBD should update an international biosafety and risk assessment framework that is based on precaution and functional to assess risks presented by new technologies, including gene editing, and that is able to assess the risks of socioeconomic and ecosystem impacts before these technologies are deployed in countries at individual level. All new technologies, especially gene drives, involve cross-border impacts, therefore, once deployed, they will affect other parts of CBD.
- The importance of the moratorium on technological solutions is a great achievement made by CBD, where civil society organizations involvement was highly relevant. It is an achievement that should be communicated, reaffirmed and sustained.

ANNEX

List of participants

ONG	Country
Sobrevivencia	Paraguay
CODES	Paraguay
Instituto Gaia	Brasil
Probioma	Bolivia
Reacción Climática	Bolivia
Alianza CDB*	Bolivia
AIDA**	Guatemala
Vida Silvestre	Uruguay
Via Campesina*	Argentina
Patagonia Natural	Argentina
Fundación CAUCE	Argentina
Taller Ecologista	Argentina
CASA RIO	Argentina
Foro del Mar Patagónico y Áreas de Influencia**	Argentina
WCS Argentina	Argentina
Fundación Biodiversidad	Argentina
Bosques Nativos Argentinos para la Biodiversidad	Argentina
Consorcio TICCA*	Argentina
COECOceiba	Costa Rica
Guyra	Paraguay
UICN Sur**	Ecuador
Sociedad Peruana de Derecho Ambiental SPDA	Perú
Nativa	Bolivia
Tierra de Derechos	Brasil
Costa Humboldt	Chile
Fundación Natura	Panamá
Amigos de la Tierra*	Argentina
Centro Mexicano de Derechos Ambientales (CEMDA)	México
Colectivo por la Autonomía (COA) y Red por la defensa de Maíz de Mexico	México
Grain International*	Argentina
FARN	Argentina

* Organization with international reach

** Organization with regional reach

REGIONAL WORKSHOP

**CONTRIBUTIONS BY NGO OF LATIN AMERICA
AND THE CARIBBEAN TO THE POST 2020
GLOBAL BIODIVERSITY FRAMEWORK**

Buenos Aires, April 23 and 24, 2019.

