

SUBMISSION BY THE EU AND ITS MEMBER STATES TO CBD NOTIFICATIONS:

2019-108: SUBMISSION OF VIEWS ON POSSIBLE TARGETS, INDICATORS AND BASELINES FOR THE POST-2020 GLOBAL BIODIVERSITY FRAMEWORK AND PEER REVIEW OF A DOCUMENT ON INDICATORS

2019-115: SUBMISSION OF VIEWS ON POSSIBLE TARGETS AND INDICATORS FOR THE POST-2020 GLOBAL BIODIVERSITY FRAMEWORK RELATED TO THE INTERLINKAGES AND INTERDEPENDENCIES BETWEEN BIODIVERSITY AND CLIMATE CHANGE

3 February 2020

Contents

Introduction	1
Notification 2019-108:	2
a) Targets, indicators and baselines	2
b) Peer review of the document “Indicators for global and national biodiversity targets – Experience and indicator resources for development of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework” (CBD/SBSTTA/23/INF/4)	3
Notification 2019-115:	7

Introduction

This submission integrates EU and its Member States’ positions related to both views on possible targets, indicators and baselines for the post-2020 global biodiversity framework and peer review of a document on indicators (CBD Notification 2019-108) and views on possible targets and indicators for the post-2020 global biodiversity framework related to the interlinkages and interdependencies between biodiversity and climate change (CBD Notification 2019-115).





Notification 2019-108:

SBSTTA 23 requested the Executive Secretary to invite written submissions from Parties and others on **views on possible targets, indicators and baselines** related to the drivers of biodiversity loss as well as on species conservation and the mainstreaming of biodiversity across sectors in relation to the development of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework.

Suggested elements for the submission to CBD Notification:

a) Targets, indicators and baselines

The EU and its Member States have submitted their views in response to CBD Notification 2019-075 (submission of 20th September 2019), Notification 2019-008 (submission of 14th May 2019), Notification 2018-063 (submission of 20th December 2018) and Notification 2018-063 (submission of 27th August 2018). Further views have been expressed in the statements and positions made at the 23rd meeting of the Subsidiary Body for Scientific, Technical, and Technological Advice in Montreal, 25-29 November 2019 and first Open Ended Working Group in Nairobi, 27-30 August 2019. We are currently assessing the targets in the Zero draft of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework and the draft monitoring framework, and we are looking forward to the discussions at the OEWG2.



b) Peer review of the document “Indicators for global and national biodiversity targets – Experience and indicator resources for development of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework” (CBD/SBSTTA/23/INF/4)

Introduction

The EU and its Member States fully supports SBSTTA recommendation 23/01¹, which invites Parties to peer review of the documents on indicators (CBD/SBSTTA/23/INF/4 and (CBD/SBSTTA/23/INF/3) on indicators for the global biodiversity framework.

(13) Requests the Executive Secretary to submit for peer review by Parties and stakeholders the document on „Indicators for global and national biodiversity targets: experience and indicator resources for development of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework”², and, in collaboration with other members of the Biodiversity Indicators Partnership, to prepare an analysis of the use of indicators in the sixth national reports, and drawing upon this information, as well as the inputs to the peer review and other relevant information³, including CBD/SBSTTA/23/INF/3, to prepare a document that identifies the range of relevant existing indicators, baselines, baseline dates, or other appropriate methods for monitoring changes in biodiversity, indicator gaps, and, where relevant options for filling such gaps and for a monitoring framework for the post-2020 global biodiversity framework, taking into account the outcomes of the second meeting of the Open-ended Working Group on the Post-2020 Global Biodiversity Framework, and to issue the document no later than six weeks in advance of the twenty-fourth meeting of the Subsidiary Body on Scientific, Technical and Technological Advice for its consideration.

The present submission answers to this invitation, issued through the above notification.

Suggestion for the submission to CBD Notification

The European Union and its Member States thank the Secretariat for the opportunity to contribute to the peer review on indicators for the global biodiversity framework and are pleased to contribute to Notification No. 2019-108. The EU and its Member States welcome the document on indicators for global and national biodiversity targets: experience and indicator resources for development of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework (CBD/SBSTTA/INF/4) and the document on the post-2020 biodiversity framework: targets, indicators and measurability implications at the global and national level (CBD/SBSTTA/INF/3) as well as other relevant information prepared for the twenty-third meeting of the Subsidiary Body on Scientific, Technical and Technological Advice.

¹ <https://www.cbd.int/doc/recommendations/sbstta-23/sbstta-23-rec-01-en.pdf>

² CBD/SBSTTA/23/INF/4

³ Including but not limited to documentation related to or developed in connection with the Sustainable Development Goals, the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development, Biodiversity Indicators Partnership, the United Nations Environment Programme – World Conservation Monitoring Centre, and those contained in the relevant sections of the documents prepared for the twenty-third meeting of the Subsidiary Body on Scientific, Technical and Technological Advice.

Views and suggestions regarding the documents on indicators (CBD/SBSTTA/23/INF/4 and (CBD/SBSTTA/23/INF/3):

On the lessons learned from the indicators for the Strategic Plan (parts A, B, C of CBD/SBSTTA/INF/4)

As mentioned in part A and B of CBD/SBSTTA/INF/4, the 'flexible framework' list of indicators for the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020 was adopted in 2016 (cf. CBD COP decision XIII/28). It lists 146 indicators, out of which 82 were classified as available, 34 were under active development and 30 were simply suggestions for development. The Biodiversity Indicators Partnership (BIP) has been instrumental in supporting the development of indicators for monitoring progress towards the Aichi targets and involves over 60 organisations producing, using or otherwise supporting biodiversity indicators.

The EU and its MS expect that the monitoring framework for the post-2020 global biodiversity framework will build on the elements of the existing framework that were effective, and will be developed in parallel with the post-2020 targets, in an iterative way. It should include as much as possible indicators that are currently available, or that would be feasible to develop (and to mobilise data for) in the near future. List of indicators should be limited in order to rationalize the resources. Indicators should be closely interconnected with related targets and baselines, baseline dates or other appropriate methods for monitoring changes in biodiversity. The indicators have to be aligned (that is, they are calculated with the methodologies and data sources) for all Conventions and Agreements (SDG, OECD, IPCC, LULUCF).

Additional considerations for identifying indicators for the post-2020 global biodiversity framework (parts D of CBD/SBSTTA/INF/4)

i. On the structure of the framework and its measurability implications

The EU and its Member States would like to reiterate that the global biodiversity framework needs to follow a clear interconnected logical flow for the target topics, such as the one used in the Zero draft (cf. Theory of change). The monitoring framework should follow the same structure and include indicators and associated baselines. The structure of the indicator-based monitoring framework is well described and illustrated in CBD/SBSTTA/INF/3 (section 3).

The EU and its Member States would support the development of a Tier approach for the indicator framework similar to that is being used under the Sustainable Development Goals (cf. section D of CBD/SBSTTA/23/INF/4).

ii. Relationship between indicators to track progress towards national and global targets

Another lesson learned from the current framework is the lack of ownership of most Aichi Targets, which is also reflected in the weak relationship between indicators used to track progress towards national targets and global indicators used to track progress towards global targets. To improve this in the future, the EU and its MS consider that the global biodiversity framework should be flexible and allow for clear interconnections between top-down, (cf. global Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2010-2020), common to all, and as far as possible bottom-up approaches (cf. NBSAPs and other relevant commitments), taking into account the context and realities of each country and region.

As highlighted in Annex 1, 35 indicators from the full list in CBD Decision XIII/28 have *potential* for disaggregation to the national level. In addition, the BIP includes more than 70 indicators which could be used by Parties. Few of these indicators are, however, being taken up at national level. In addition, national indicators used for the assessment of NBSAPs and other national commitments vary because of a lack of consistency between national and global targets. This has meant that it is not possible to monitor progress by Parties towards the Aichi Targets in a consistent and comparable way at global and national level across countries. It has also meant that it is often very difficult to add up progress across countries (at national level) so as to evaluate whether these aggregate efforts are sufficient to meet the global targets, or need to be reviewed.

We therefore support the proposal to strengthen the relationship between indicators used to track national and global target (cf. CBD/SBSTTA/INF/4 page 11) and that, in addition to the broader set of indicators encouraged for use in the post-2020 framework, a smaller sub-set of “headline indicators” is also agreed upon (cf. CBD/SBSTTA/INF/3, section 5). These headline indicators would focus in priority on the long-term outcome goals and a small number of action targets where approaches can be similar/comparable (e.g. coverage of PAs). The criteria for the headline indicators is that the metric used is consistent and comparable across countries. Such an approach could help to sequence and prioritise efforts on a smaller set of pressure, state and response indicators that are most important to monitor in a consistent and comparable way across all countries. Agreement on such a sub-set of headline indicators could help achieve greater transparency and measurability between global and national targets. This would also contribute directly to the development of baselines. We recommend to combine the CBD/SBSTTA/23/INF/4, which provides lists of indicators that are currently available to monitor progress towards possible thematic targets, with CBD/SBSTTA/23/INF/3 which includes in its section 5, Tables of potential indicators, which would meet the headline indicator criteria (i.e., datasets exist whereby the metrics used are consistent and comparable across countries).

iii. Filling indicator gaps

The indicators database from UNEP-WCMC includes no global indicators for Aichi Biodiversity Target 2, only a single indicator for Targets 16, 17, 18 and 20, and very few indicators for Targets 1, 15, and 19.

Therefore, a strong emphasis should be placed on filling the indicator gap on responses, including on inputs (i.e. financial and non-financial, public and private, national and international), outputs (e.g. positive incentives and their level of ambition), and outcomes (e.g. increase in restoration of degraded ecosystem coverage), which would as much as possible allow a quantitative comparison of the actions taken by countries to meet the global targets. This would also allow a cumulative assessment (i.e. national aggregation) of the actions taken across countries to identify whether national commitments and implementation are on track to meet the global post-2020 targets. The ratcheting up mechanism should address the NBSAPs and national commitments could contribute to this process (cf. CBD/SBSTTA/23/INF/3).

iv. On the baselines

The issue of biodiversity baselines has been extensively debated over years until recent months (cf. IPBES global assessment). The actual scientific issue is the highly variable timing of actual human impacts around the world and goes far beyond timing of economic growth. The EU notes the emerging consensus from the IUCN Species Survival Commission (SSC) that baselines for long term assessments can be variable, based on the timing of impacts. The impacts to be considered are both within the

country and those impacts imported from countries elsewhere (i.e. “embodied impacts” or “telecoupling”). In the context of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework, baselines should be developed and closely interconnected with related targets and indicators so that progress to targets can be assessed.

Conclusions

The analysis of indicators is directly interconnected with the development of SMART targets and will need to be further updated as draft post-2020 targets are put forward. More specifically, once target nomenclature and formulation have been further developed, global indicators will be tied to each of the post-2020 targets, taking into consideration the need for national and regional targets to scale up to global targets and vice versa (see para 28 in CBD/SBSTTA/23/2/Add.4).



Notification 2019-115:

Suggested elements for the submission on climate change

Rationale

IPCC and IPBES latest reports converge on the strong linkage and interdependence between climate change, biodiversity loss and land and ocean degradation as well as on the utmost urgency to act. We are facing an existential threat. The evidence shows that without action now the scale of the problem will continue to increase and become more difficult to address. We cannot tackle biodiversity loss without addressing climate change, but it is equally impossible to tackle climate change without addressing ecosystem degradation.

The EU and its MS express deep concern about the already visible and increasing impacts of climate change on local, regional and global biodiversity, ecosystems, on water resources and on food security, nutrition and natural disasters. For these reasons, climate change aspects need to be integrated in the post-2020 global biodiversity framework.

The EU encourages the post-2020 biodiversity framework to take into consideration best available science as reflected in the IPCC special report on global warming of 1,5 degrees that finds that in order to hold the increase in global average temperature to 1.5 °C above pre-industrial levels, the level of greenhouse gas emissions in 2030 should be 25–30 gigatonnes of carbon dioxide equivalent/year. The EU further notes the UNEP's 2019 Emission Gap Report that reconfirms that even if all current unconditional commitments in Parties' Nationally Determined Contributions (NDCs) under the Paris Agreement are fully implemented, temperatures are expected to rise by 3.2°C globally bringing even wider ranging and more destructive climate impacts. The report further states that on an annual basis global GHG emissions are to be reduced by 7.6 per cent per year from 2020 to 2030 to meet the 1.5°C goal and 2.7 per cent per year for the 2°C goal. This means that the collective ambition in the Nationally Determined Contributions must increase at least fivefold compared to the current ambition in order to meet the 1.5°C goal and threefold for the 2°C goal. Hence, we need to scale up rapidly and substantially the implementation of technological and societal and nature-based solutions to deliver the GHG emission reductions needed over the next decade.

The EU and its MS acknowledge that 'nature-based solutions' with safeguards are 'ecosystem-based approaches'. EU and MS stress that nature-based solutions with safeguards can deliver multiple and cost-effective benefits in addition to climate change mitigation and adaptation and disaster risk reduction, including benefits to human health, food and water security, land degradation neutrality, sustainable development and poverty eradication, gender equality and women's empowerment, respect for human rights and respect for the rights of indigenous peoples and local communities.

The EU and its MS also stress that stepping up action for climate change at all levels and within and across all sectors requires scaling up of biodiversity conservation and ecosystem restoration, investing in nature-based solutions (with safeguards), strong emissions reduction in all sectors in order to pursue efforts to limit the global temperature increase to 1.5°C above pre-industrial levels and to reduce the

risks and adverse effects of climate change. In any case, plans and actions are needed to increase ecosystems' resilience.

The issue of climate change is closely connected to ecosystem conservation and restoration, as on the one hand ecosystem conservation and restoration is a 'nature-based solution' to climate change mitigation and adaptation and on the other hand both ecosystem conservation and restoration need to consider the ever increasing and accelerating impacts of climate change.

Suggestions for elements for the post-2020 biodiversity framework

Related to preamble

In the preamble of the post-2020 framework the link and interdependence of biodiversity loss and climate change need to be clearly stated. One can draw on previous CBD COP Decision on wording: for example: CBD COP 14/5 states:

Deeply concerned that failing to hold the increase in the global average temperature to well below 2°C above pre-industrial levels would place many species and ecosystems with limited adaptive capacity as well as the people that depend on their functions and services, especially indigenous peoples and local communities and rural women, under very high risk,

Deeply concerned also that escalating destruction, degradation and fragmentation of ecosystems would reduce the capacity of ecosystems to store carbon and lead to increases in greenhouse gas emissions, reduce the resilience and stability of ecosystems, and make the climate change crisis ever more challenging,

Recognizing that climate change is a major and growing driver of biodiversity loss, and that biodiversity and ecosystem functions and services, significantly contribute to climate change adaptation, mitigation and disaster risk reduction,

Stepping up global action at all levels and sectors requires scaling up of biodiversity conservation and ecosystem restoration, investing in ecosystem-based approaches/nature-based solutions, emissions reduction in all sectors in order to pursue efforts to limit the temperature increase to 1.5°C above pre-industrial levels and to reduce risks and negative consequences of climate change to biodiversity.

In the preamble it could also be highlighted that with a global temperature increase of 2°C it is projected that coral reefs will disappear, and that they are already under high risk at 1.5°C. Losing coral reefs means losing a unique biodiversity rich ecosystem on which half a billion people depend directly or indirectly for their livelihoods. Once the tipping point for the survival of coral reefs is passed, the loss of species and the deterioration of other systems may cascade more quickly and irreversibly. Other species and ecosystems are also approaching the edge of their refugia e.g. in montane habitats. Further it should be considered that climate change interacts and exacerbates the other drivers such as destruction, degradation, and fragmentation of habitats, invasive species, overexploitation of resources and pollution. Furthermore, the impact these drivers reduces the capacity of species and ecosystems to adapt to climate change. e.g. through reduced connectivity, lower genetic diversity and also reduce the capacity of ecosystems to deliver climate regulation services.

The Arctic is warming more than twice the rate of the rest of the world. Climate change is by far the worst threat to Arctic biodiversity. The changes have altered Arctic ecosystems and in some cases are causing the loss of entire habitats, with consequences for people and communities who rely on and benefit from Arctic ecosystems. These and other impacts of climate change in the Arctic have consequences for the entire global climate system and pose fundamental risks to many ecosystem services.

Related to targets

It is important to consider the following:

- Recognize that the IPBES report indicates that the ambition of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework should match the ability to unlock the estimated 37% of climate change mitigation potential of nature-based solutions with safeguards that are needed until 2030 to keep global temperature increase well below 2°C⁴ and pursue efforts to limit it to 1.5°C.
- Integrating climate aspects into the target framework should highlight the interlinkages and interdependencies between biodiversity and climate change in the context of sustainable development. Climate related targets should be easy to communicate and attainable and complementary to the Paris Agreement and recognize the nationally determined nature of targets.
- Biodiversity, climate change and sustainable development goals can only be achieved if all - technological and societal and nature-based- solutions are stepped up ensuring also that all these different solutions synergise, and in any case do not conflict. Next to technological and societal efforts nature-based solutions with safeguards help create climate-resilient ecosystems and communities, and may also provide cost effective measures to capture and store carbon and reduce greenhouse gas emissions.
- The post-2020 global biodiversity framework including its targets and the sections on monitoring and reporting should provide the framework for scaling up the implementation of nature-based solutions with regards to increasing adaptive capacity and resilience of ecosystems.
- When formulating conservation, restoration, and sustainable use targets, both the impact of climate change on ecosystems and the contribution of ecosystems to climate change mitigation and adaptation and disaster risk reduction should be taken into account.
- Full use should be made, as appropriate, of sustainable climate financing instruments for conservation, restoration and sustainable use of ecosystems and for the implementation of nature-based solutions towards increasing adaptive capacity and increase resilience.
- Safeguards and principles included in the adopted voluntary guidelines on EbA and eco-DRR (CBD COP 14/5) should apply for the implementation of nature-based solutions.
- Climate change impacts as described by IPCC and IPBES need to be considered in several/many targets of the framework. It is imperative that other relevant targets which sit alongside a

⁴ See IPBES GA key message D8

target on NBS (e.g. ecosystem restoration target), are coherent with, and foster, adaptation and resilience of ecosystems to the increasing impacts of climate change and reduce the threat of extinctions. Targets (e.g. related to conservation, restoration, invasive alien species, sustainable use etc.) that are not considering climate change in an appropriate manner will not be 'realistic' nor appropriate.

- The development of Green Infrastructure is an extensive, economically viable and effective tool to address the impacts of climate change and to help people adapt or mitigate its adverse effects. It strengthens connectivity between existing natural areas, improves the ecological quality of ecosystems and increases their resilience.
- As coral reefs are severely threatened by the impacts of climate change (water temperature rising, acidification, etc.), the International Coral Reefs Initiative (ICRI) is currently working on a coral reefs target and related indicators to submit to the CBD. ICRI learned from the relative failure of the Aichi Target 10 (also related to coral reefs and other vulnerable ecosystems) and aims to provide an ambitious yet realistic goal, taking account of the effects of climate change.
- The post-2020 biodiversity framework should recognize that, there is a growing urgency to address the populations at higher risks of negative consequences of global warming, including indigenous peoples and the world's poorest communities who directly depend on ecosystem functions and services. Regions at disproportionately higher risk include the Arctic, dryland regions, small-island developing states, and the least developed countries.