Ref. Ares(2021)2773126 - 26/04/2021

Template for the review of the draft information document CBD/SBSTTA/24/INF/21 on detailed scientific and technical information to support the review of the proposed goals and targets in the updated zero draft of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework

TEMPLATE FOR COMMENTS

Contact information	
Surname:	TELLER
Given Name:	Anne
Government (if applicable)**:**	European Commission
Organization:	
Address:	Avenue de Beaulieu 5
City:	Brussels 1160
Country:	Belgium
E-mail:	Anne.Teller@ec.europa.eu

General comments
This is an example of a general comment
Introduce further concepts of ecosystem functionality instead of ecosystem area to protect or restore for enabling better prioritization of areas, avoid paper PA
Introduce socio-ecological management instead of management of PA
Introduce the integration of Climate / environmental changes into prioritization of protection and restoration since protection aims at protection ecosystems functionalities and services while enabling ecosystem processes (evolution, selections, genetic diversity and competition) or features that can help them to be resilient and or adapt to a certain extent, or provide climate refuge to species... see some ref. to literature

Specific comments		
Page	**Paragraph**	**Comment**
3	4 (e)	Suggestion to add a quote from IPCC SP 1.5 which says that a global temperature increase of 2°C is beyond the viable limit for coral reefs (the 1.5 report says that under these circumstances more than 99% of corals will be gone). See also Figure SPM 2 https://www.ipcc.ch/sr15/graphics/ The IPCC Special Report on Ocean and Cryosphere confirmed this. Coral reefs are amongst the unique system where irreversible tipping points will be passed within the next 10 years if current trends continue. To avoid this scenario we need high and aligned biodiversity and climate ambition.
13	45	Figures or examples to support the sentence affirming that "*Access and benefit-sharing (ABS) also provides an important incentive for the conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity*" should be included. At present, information on benefits shared and supporting conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity is very limited (as acknowledged also in the document). Thus, such affirmation risks to be rather weak or not based on concrete data, or otherwise it should be rephrased as in para 202 of the document ("can create").
13	46	The para seems to make a distinction between measure regulating access and

		benefit sharing (labelled as ABS) and compliance measures (lines 7-8 of the para). Yet, compliance measures under the Nagoya Protocol are part of the ABS regimes established under the instrument, thus they should still be considered as ABS measures. We suggest to remove "(ABS)" after benefit-sharing.
13	47	*"ABS agreements"* is a rather general formulation. If this is referring to MAT under the NP, we suggest to explicitly refers to MAT. *" (...) it is not **currently** possible to put an overall value on the total amount of benefits shared."* This phrasing implies that this is only the case currently, but at some point it will be possible to put an overall value on the total amount of benefits received. Given the fact that the ABS agreements will remain confidential and that it will remain difficult to put a value on non-monetary benefits, this phrasing risks to be misleading. It could be clarified already what would be the conditions that would allow for such reporting on the volume of benefits received and what would be available methodologies to assess the value of the non-monetary benefits. Currently these conditions are not there and it is a challenge that remains to be addressed.
14	48	The last part of the paragraph reports that same information as in CBD/SBSTTA/24/3/add2: "...corporate reports and websites of cosmetic and food companies found that references to ABS appear to be receiving increasing attention including by 17 per cent of beauty companies (up from 2 per cent in 2009) and 5 per cent of food and beverage companies (up from 2 per cent in 2012). However also here it is not explained how this information would be directly relevant or useful to find information on benefits generated and shared. This should be further clarified, since lack of information on the benefits shared is a concrete and real issue for an effective monitoring of progress of the ABS goal.
14	50	The first sentence stresses that information on benefits shared is sparse, particularly in monetary terms. Such specification can be misleading. Is this to say that less information is available on monetary benefits, than non-monetary benefits? If so, this is not entirely correct, since the current situation shows that information about non-monetary benefits is also very scarce and sparse. The situation on existing information on benefits shared should be described for both non-monetary and monetary benefits. Furthermore, when saying that benefits shared are likely to be a very small proportion of the total revenues of the relevant sectors, it is unclear how this conclusion is arrived. It is not specified which sectors are considered and what would be the expectation with regard to the proportion/amount of the total turnover that should be shared and how this would be calculated. It should also be clarified what it is considered as total revenues, whether these revenues are only or mostly derived from the use of genetic resources, whether the costs of investments in R&D are or should be taken into account when assessing the adequacy of this proportion. Figures are only given for two sectors and they make reference to the value attributed to their global markets (without specifying what is the contribution to this value deriving from the use of genetic resources). The whole paragraph risks to be inaccurate and inappropriate for a scientific and technical information document if not supported by more specific figures and a better articulated analysis.

14	51	The document provides information only concerning the level of implementation of the NP measures. Yet, in previous paras reference is done also to other ABS instruments (such as the ITPGRFAA and the WHO PIP framework) which are relevant to benefit sharing. Additional information on the implementation of such frameworks would also be useful.
14	52	It should be clarified how additional reporting could solve the underlying problem that it is (and may well will continue to be) difficult to obtain information on the volume and nature of benefits shared because they are subject to private terms and confidentiality clauses. If the ABS agreements are often confidential, how can States access that information in order to report? (see p. 15, para. 53, last sentence). Additional guidance on this would be useful.
44-48, 56-61	150-162, 184-201	More key information nature-based solutions on rural and urban areas is available on The EU–Brazil sector dialogue on nature-based solutions (2019) The EU–Brazil sector dialogue on nature-based solutions - Publications Office of the EU (europa.eu) and Nature-based solutions: State of the art in EU-funded projects (2020), https://op.europa.eu/en/publication-detail/-/publication/8bb07125-4518-11eb-b59f-01aa75ed71a1/language-en/format-PDF/source-203252411 with six detailed reports biodiversity, climate change mitigation and adaptation (including flooding), water quality, air quality and microclimate, sustainable communities, innovative governance and business models, and market challenges and solutions.
44	150	Include after … *and adapt to climate change.* ***At the moment terrestrial and marine ecosystems roughly absorb half of the anthropogenic CO2 emissions***.
44	152	Replace 'or' with 'and' : nature-based solutions ***and*** ecosystem-based approaches Rationale: the word 'or' gives the false impression that nature-based solutions and ecosystem-based approaches are different approaches. However, both are umbrella terms for working with nature delivering multiple benefits including for biodiversity.
45	153	Replace 'or' with 'and' : nature-based solutions ***and*** ecosystem-based approaches
46	154	Replace 'or' with 'and' : nature-based solutions ***and*** ecosystem-based approaches
46	156	Delete '*different types of*' rationale there are no 'different types of nature-based solutions. There are measures currently wrongly branded as nature-based solutions
47	157	**Suggestion to DELETE or REWRITE the first part of this paragraph**. It includes several misleading statements. Most monoculture plantations are not nature-based solutions. The part starting with 'Further to ensure fairness … is good.
56		Nature-based solutions and ecosystem services Target 10. By 2030, ensure that, nature-based solutions and ecosystem approach contribute to regulation of air quality, hazards and extreme events and quality and quantity of water for at least [XXX million] people
57	186	Replace 'or' with 'and' : nature-based solutions ***and*** ecosystem-based approaches
58	190	Replace 'or' with 'and' : nature-based solutions ***and*** ecosystem-based approaches

58	191	**Suggestion to DELETE the first part paragraph**, as it includes several misleading statements, which are factually wrong. Keep the last sentence (underlined in yellow) for your ease it is copied below While nature-based solutions are increasingly used around the world, information on the extent of their use and the number of people currently benefiting from them is incomplete. While nature-based solutions or ecosystem-ecosystem based approaches often have co-benefits for biodiversity and help to create incentives for their use and their mainstreaming into decision making and planning processes, these co-benefits are not always guaranteed. Furthermore, in most cases nature-based solutions **and** ecosystem-based approaches will not be sufficient on their own to fully meet objectives for water and air quality or to completely prevent or mitigate extreme events and hazards. As such the use of nature-based solutions **and** ecosystem-based approaches should not detract from efforts to address the direct and indirect pressures on biodiversity and the other pressures which contribute to these hazards.
83-89	281-291	The evidence provided covers only knowledge component of the target. Evidence on awareness raising, educational efforts, investments in science and their role as enablers for transformative change is missing. Such evidence could include e.g. demonstration how the improved understanding of value of biodiversity to our economy and society can drive support for the GBF and the behavioral change by all actors (public, stakeholders, policy makers) needed to implement it.
83	281	Add after the first sentence: "Quality and timely data, information and knowledge on biodiversity...' a new phrase: " It is also necessary to develop relevant and effective communication and education materials, and invest in biodiversity research for knowledge, tools and instruments to make information available, accessible and understood for decision makers, business, financing and the general public."
84	282-284	Biodiversity knowledge is increasingly produced, but its accessibility and sharing is fragmented and not efficiently organized.

Comments should be sent by e-mail to secretariat@cbd.int by 23 April 2021. Please note that review comments previously sent on document CBD/SBSTTA/24/3/Add.2 will be considered in the revision of this document and there is no need to resend comments already submitted.

EU SBSTTA Focal Point

e-signed

Anne Teller

Electronically signed on 26/04/2021 16:21 (UTC+02) in accordance with article 11 of Commission Decision C(2020) 4482