**Submission of views on possible Targets, Indicators and Baselines for the Post-2020 Global Biodiversity Framework**

*Submission is in response to CBD Notification SCBD/OES/DC/KM/88539, from the Biocultural Heritage Working Group[[1]](#footnote-1): International Institute for Environment and Development (IIED), Association for Nature and Sustainable Development (ANDES, Peru), National Farmer Seed Network (China), Kenya Forestry Research Institute (KEFRI), and Lok Chetna Manch (India), in association with the International Network of Mountain Indigenous Peoples (INMIP).*

Thank-you for the opportunity to provide views on possible targets, indicators and baselines related to the drivers of biodiversity loss and on species conservation and mainstreaming biodiversity across sectors. Our comments refer to the **Zero Draft of the Post-2020 Global Biodiversity Framework** (CBD/WG2020/2/3).

The *Note by the Co-Chairs* (Background section, paragraph 8), states that successful implementation of the framework will depend on learning from past experiences, successes and challenges, including implementation of the Aichi Targets and Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020. The following are **key lessons** which should inform the development and implementation of targets related to the drivers of biodiversity loss, species conservation and mainstreaming biodiversity:

1. Addressing the key **drivers of biodiversity loss** in different natural resource and economic sectors requires active engagement, buy-in, ownership and leadership from these sectors. Yet National Biodiversity Strategies and Action Plans have been largely conceived as technical *documents* rather than as ***processes* of stakeholder engagement** – and have thus had limited impact on development sectors. Processes to actively engage different national and *local* stakeholders in priority setting and implementation should be embedded in the targets and indicators, including government agencies, local governments, indigenous peoples and local communities (IPLCs), civil society organisations and the private sector.
2. Several studies have shown that IPLCs play an important role in **species conservation** through traditional ecological knowledge and adaptive management, cultural and spiritual values and sacred sites (Berkes et al 2010; Pretty et al 2011; Verschuuren et al 2010; Pilgrim and Pretty 2010; Berkes 2018; Pungetti et al 2012). The IPBES Global Assessment on Biodiversity and Ecosystem Services found that nature is generally declining less rapidly in indigenous peoples’ lands than in other land (IPBES, 2019). However, areas managed by IPLCs are facing growing resource extraction, commodity production, mining, transport and energy infrastructure, leading to loss of traditional livelihoods and knowledge, and hampering the ability of IPLCs to conserve biodiversity. Therefore, **legally recognising and protecting the land tenure** and resource rights of IPLCs is a key lever for biodiversity conservation, and is also critical for achieving the 2030 SDGs and implementing the Paris agreement on climate change (IPBES, 2019; IPCC, 2019).
3. Mainstream development sectors erode biodiversity directly, and indirectly by eroding traditional knowledge and cultural values that have conserved biodiversity for centuries. Therefore, both **biodiversity and traditional knowledge and culture need to be mainstreamed** across development sectorsin order to reduce biodiversity loss. Cultural values and beliefs of IPLCs ensure the continued use, transmission and renewal of traditional knowledge (Berkes 2010; Swiderska 2009). Yet, indigenous knowledge and culture are being lost at an alarming rate with modernisation, outmigration, exploitation of indigenous territories and lack of support for indigenous knowledge and language transmission (FAO, 2015; UNESCO, 2003).

**Specific comments on the** **Post-2020 Global Biodiversity Framework (CBD/WG2020/2/3, Annex I)**:

**I. Introduction**

**B. The Purpose:**

The framework should be implemented through activities at both the national and local level, rather than ‘primarily through activities at the national level’ (paragraph 3), as local stakeholders will have a critical role to play in on-the-ground implementation. This section should emphasise that the framework should be implemented through a process-oriented approach, since processes of stakeholder engagement will be vital for galvanising urgent and transformative action by different sectors of society.

**C. Theory of Change:**

The Theory of Change should also acknowledge the need to invest in processes of stakeholder engagement, to actively engage different sectors and actors in determining priorities for implementation and developing tools and solutions. This will be crucial to generate the ownership needed to mobilise action to reduce threats to biodiversity. We welcome the acknowledgement of the need for the full and effective participation of IPLCs in the implementation of the framework; and the statement that it will be implemented taking a rights-based approach. These are key cross-cutting principles for effective implementation and for ensuring the framework contributes to meeting peoples’ needs and wellbeing.

**II. The Framework**

**D. 2030 action targets:** We suggest some changes to the proposed Targets in the Zero Draft – underlining indicates text which should be added:

1. **Reducing threats to biodiversity**

**Target 2:** “Protect sites of particular importance for biodiversity, through protected areas and other effective area-based conservation measures, including IPLC conserved areas and territories, by 2030 covering at least [X] of such sites and at least [X] of land and seas ~~with at least [X] under strict protection~~, whilst ensuring the traditional land and resource rights on IPLCs are fully protected”

*Justification*: Expansion of state-run protected areas is likely to have negative impacts on IPLC’s livelihoods and rights, and hence on the 2030 agenda, and could undermine traditional livelihood systems that conserve biodiversity. IPBES (2019) found that protected areas are not yet effectively or equitably managed. At the same time, ambitious protected area targets are unlikely to be met through expansion of state-run protected areas alone. Therefore, it is important that IPLC conserved areas and territories are recognised and protected as part of protected area systems. Targets for areas under strict protection should be avoided as they could have devastating impacts on the livelihoods of IPLCs, and on their conservation efforts.

*Indicators* should be included on the number of indigenous conserved lands and territories that are legally recognised, protected and supported, and the % of a countries’ conservation area that is co-managed and self-governed.

**Target 6.** The term ‘nature-based solutions’ should be replaced by ‘nature-and-culture-based solutions’ or ‘bio-cultural solutions’.

*Justification*: Many ‘nature-based solutions’ are in fact ‘culture-based’ or ‘people-based’ solutions given the role of IPLCs in biodiversity conservation and sustainable use. Recognising this role is important to encourage continued biodiversity stewardship by IPLCs, and to support CBD article 8(j) “respect, preserve and maintain knowledge innovations and practices”, 10 (c ) “protect and encourage customary use”, and the Sharm-El-Sheik Declaration on Nature and Culture (CBD/COP/14/INF/46).

**b) Meeting peoples’ needs through sustainable use and benefit-sharing**

A new stand-alone Target should be added on:

“Ensure by 2030 that the knowledge, innovations and practices of IPLCs are respected, preserved and maintained, customary sustainable use is protected and encouraged, and the rights of IPLCs to their traditional lands, territories, resources and knowledge are legally recognised and protected.”

*Justification*: Some 370-500 million indigenous peoples are closely dependent on biodiversity for meeting their livelihoods needs and wellbeing, yet their ability to meet their needs through sustainable use is widely threatened by erosion of traditional knowledge and land and resource rights.

1. **Tools and solutions for implementation and mainstreaming**

Target 12. Add “and associated IPLC culture” after “biodiversity” on the 1st and 3rd lines.

*Justification*: Loss of culture and traditional knowledge are drivers of biodiversity loss and therefore need to be mainstreamed along with biodiversity.

Target 13. “Integrate biodiversity values and associated cultural values…” “…ensuring by 2030 that biodiversity values and associated cultural values are mainstreamed across all sectors, including education...”

*Justification:* As for Target 12. Mainstreaming IPLC culture and cultural values in education systems is critical to promote transmission of traditional knowledge, values and languages that promote biodiversity conservation.

Target 14. Reform economic sectors towards biologically and culturally sustainable practices….. negative impacts on biodiversity and associated culture.

*Justification*: As for Target 12.

Target 15. “…for implementing the framework at national and local level…”

*Justification*: Channelling increased resources to the local level including to IPLCs will be critical for implementing the targets.

Target 16. “.. impacts of biotechnology on biodiversity and associated IPLC culture”

*Justification*: As for Target 12.

Target 17. “People everywhere, including governments, civil society and industry..”

*Justification*: Best be more specific.

Target 18. Should include ‘…preservation of knowledge and cultural values relating to biodiversity…’

Target 19. Change ‘promote’ to ‘ensure…’, ‘ as well as youth and elders’ , ‘ensuring by 2030 equitable participation and secure rights over traditional lands, territories, resources and knowledge’.

*Justification:* Many governments have not actively engaged IPLCs in implementing the Aichi Targets, despite articles 8(j) and 10 ( c) and repeated calls for this in CBD documents. Engaging and empowering elders is critical to maintain traditional knowledge and customary use. Recognition of rights in law is often not enough – such rights need to be made secure through enforcement, and secure rights to lands and territories are particularly important.

A new stand-alone Target should be added on:

“Ensure that IPLCs participate fully and effectively in all aspects of implementation of the framework; and that by 2030, traditional knowledge and culture are mainstreamed across economic sectors, development planning and education systems; all forms of racial discrimination and violence against indigenous peoples are eliminated; and that the UN Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples is fully implemented in national law”.

*Justification:* Much of the world’s biodiversity is located on land managed by IPLCs, but traditional knowledge and culture for biodiversity conservation is being rapidly eroded by mainstream development processes and education systems, racial discrimination and lack of recognition of IPLC rights to land and self-determination.

*Indicators* should include the extent of participation of IPLCs, including women, youth and elders, in implementation of the framework; the extent to which indigenous knowledge and languages are integrated into school and university curricula; and the development of national legal frameworks to implement UNDRIPs.

**E. Implementation support mechanisms**

13. (a) As well as an increase in resources from all sources, effective implementation requires greater allocation of resources to stakeholder engagement processes and to support activities led by different stakeholder groups, including IPLCs.

(b) Capacity-building, will need to be locally determined and determined by different stakeholder groups, as well as nationally determined and country-driven, rather than “particularly nationally determined”.

(c) and (d ) relate to scientific information and technical cooperation, but there is no mention of traditional knowledge. The preservation and strengthening of traditional knowledge of IPLCs is also crucial for implementation. Up to 80% of biodiversity is located on IPLC lands and territories – yet the traditional knowledge that provides locally tailored practices for conservation and sustainable use, and ecological values and worldviews, is fast disappearing. This knowledge needs to be strengthened by supporting inter-generational transmission, community-controlled biocultural databases, sharing of traditional knowledge amongst IPLCs, and recognition and respect for TEK alongside science (through multiple-evidence based approaches).

**F. Enabling conditions**

14. (a) In line with accepted CBD terminology, this should be changed to: “The full and effective participation of IPLCs..”. The second part of the sentence should be changed to “and the legal recognition and protection of their rights to land, resources and self-determination, in accordance with the UN Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples”. This is a critical enabling condition given that most of the world’s biodiversity is located on lands and territories managed by indigenous people – secure land rights are a vital incentive for communities to invest in protecting and restoring biodiversity.

15. We suggest that a sentence should be added at the end of this paragraph: “This should include the systematic elimination of all forms of discrimination and violence against IPLCs”.

**G. Responsibility and transparency**

16. (a) “Reflecting the framework in relevant planning processes, including national, local and sectoral biodiversity strategies and action plans” – responsibility and leadership must be shared and devolved to key stakeholders to motivate action.

(b) Indicators should be identified in collaboration with each stakeholder group and tailored to their needs, priorities and constraints to ensure they are relevant, practical and useful for them, and hence are monitored in practice.

**H. Outreach, awareness and uptake**

Outreach, awareness and uptake strategies will need to be tailored to different sectors and stakeholder groups. Experience with biodiversity and environment strategies shows that uptake will depend crucially on actively engaging diverse national and local stakeholders in processes of joint priority setting and analysis; identifying and supporting ‘change agents’ in different sectors/groups; conducting economic studies to make the case; and securing high level political support.

1. Contact: Krystyna Swiderska (IIED): Krystyna.swiderska@iied.org [↑](#footnote-ref-1)