**COMMENTS ON PROPOSED POSSIBLE STRUCTURE, STRATEGIC GOALS, TARGETS AND INDICATORS OF A POST 2020 GLOBAL BIODIVERSITY FRAMEWORK**

South Africa welcomes the opportunity to provide comments on a possible structure, strategic goals, targets and indicators of a post 2020 global biodiversity framework. South Africa is supportive of either fine tuning or adding to the existing Strategic Plan for Biodiversity’s 20 Aichi Targets, or the development of a new framework and targets as proposed in Non-paper 02 - Zero draft.

South Africa has prepared a table of specific comments for each of the elements in option 2 Non-paper 02 - Zero draft. This table also includes reference to which elements of the current Aichi framework would benefit from retaining and fine tuning the existing structure and targets. We are providing this as a working document with high level key issues listed for all elements. Suggestions for indicators are included for some of the proposed targets. As this framework evolves South Africa will provide recommendation of indicators that we’ll be able to effectively report on.

**High level summary of key issues:**

**If Option 1 (refinement of the Aichi Targets) is followed, then key gaps that we would recommend be addressed include:**

1. The inclusion of an ecosystem status target similar to species target 12;
2. Aichi 5 needs to focus on habitat loss for all ecosystems and should not be biased towards forest loss only;
3. Aichi 6 needs to address unsustainable use of all species in both the terrestrial and marine environment (current focus is only on marine species);
4. Aichi 9 on invasive species needs a new focus on including areas impacted by invasives
5. Aichi 12 requires rewording not to only focus on extinctions but on halting declines of all threatened and **socio-economically important species**;
6. The inclusion of a SMART ABS-linked conservation target is required in the post 2020 framework. However this should not in any way be seen as replacing the Nagoya Protocol which we recommend should maintain its status as a Treaty and carry on to be ratified and implemented/operationalised as per Target 16 of the Aichi Biodiversity target..

**A few key gaps in Option 2** **include:**

1. Needing target 10 to focus on positive incentives and not only reducing perverse incentives.
2. Ensuring that under enabling factors Target 8, that an element is added to focus on producing the key science based products required to implement this framework, wording similar to Aichi Target 19 could be considered.
3. Including development of spatial data and the use of systematic biodiversity conservation planning tools to facilitate efficient implementation of the framework especially the prioritisation of areas for protection and retention / restoration of ecosystem provisioning services.

If this proposed new framework is developed we suggest a stronger focus on wording that highlights the unlocking of benefits from biodiversity, currently the framework feels a little too focused on avoiding loss.

The proposal of benefit sharing not limited to genetic resources requires further unpacking to clarify the following:

1. What benefits are to be shared?
2. On what terms?
3. By who and with who?
4. How will access to the resources whose benefits are to be shared be regulated?
5. Who are the anticipated providers of such resources whose benefits are to be shared and who are the potential users?

These and many other related unclear processes need to be researched, clarified, negotiated, and agreed upon before a decision can be taken to include this in the Post 2020 GBF for implementation. This should be done considering the fact that it took years to negotiate and agree on the Nagoya Protocol and its provisions which has a similar objective as the newly proposed benefit sharing. Therefore it would be a challenge to just come up with this loaded and complex and sensitive idea and think it will just make its way to the Post 2020 GBF WITHOUT FURTHER UNPACKING IT and subjecting it to further negotiations and agreement as its counterpart on genetic resources (the Nagoya Protocol on ABS).

Furthermore, the 3rd objective of the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD) states: the fair and equitable sharing of the benefits arising out of the **utilization of genetic resources**, including by appropriate access to genetic resources and by appropriate transfer of relevant technologies, taking into account all rights over those resources and to technologies, and by appropriate funding.

It should therefore be considered whether in this objective the newly proposed activity/target/milestone of ABS beyond genetic resources might require an amendment of the objectives and subsequently the text of the CBD as per Article 29 of the Convention..

**South Africa appreciates the focus on ecosystems evident in option 2**, tracking of ecosystem status spatially for all ecosystem types in the marine, coastal, freshwater and terrestrial realms has been central to South Africa’s biodiversity conservation approach, and has ensured priority ecosystems (those that are both threatened and under protected) are the focus of mainstreaming, land-use decision making and protected area expansion actions.

Option 2 is supported as it provides an opportunity to explicitly include targets that focus on nature based solutions to climate change as well as social and economic issues.

South Africa supports the continuation of the Global Strategy for Plant Conservation in the post 2020 biodiversity framework. The Global Strategy for Plant Conservation (GSPC) has played an essential role in uniting the South African plant conservation community around a common commitment to the conservation and sustainable use of plant diversity. We recommend that the successor to the GSPC or updated GSPC targets, needs to be **clearly ‘nested’ within the overall global biodiversity framework**. We propose the inclusion of **plant-specific milestones (or quantifiable targets), and supporting indicators in the post-2020 framework**. Such milestones should be ambitious, specific, time-bound, action-oriented and simple to understand. They would be science and conservation-based with clear outcomes that would **underpin and contribute to the new or revised biodiversity targets.**

South Africa is currently concerned with recent discussions linked with expanding the ambit of Nagoya and we feel strongly that it has a status of a Treaty and was negotiated for the purpose of implementing the 3rd objective of the CBD. It is still relevant and hence what we believe is required is ratification by those Parties to the Convention that have not done so and strengthening its operationalization.

Basing its future in the Post 2020 GBF under the “relationship between the Convention and its Protocols” seems as a bit out of context as Article 32 of the Convention describes this relationship as follows: “A State or a regional economic integration organization may not become a Party to a protocol unless it is, or becomes at the same time, a Contracting Party to this Convention. Decisions under any protocol shall be taken only by the Parties to the protocol concerned. Any Contracting Party that has not ratified, accepted or approved a protocol may participate as an observer in any meeting of the parties to that protocol”. Therefore by introducing this topic of the relationship between the Convention and its Protocols are we envisaging changing these provisions or we mean something different? South Africa would appreciate getting clarity on this.

| **Strategic Goals** | **Proposed post 2020 biodiversity targets** | **Links to Aichi biodiversity target** | **Key issues and comments** | **Recommendations for each option (1 and 2) and the rationale** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Goal A: Status of biodiversity ls (status of biodiversity):** | 1. **Healthy species population** – Addressing human activities driven extinction and declines | Aichi 12 -  By 2020 the extinction of known threatened species has been prevented and their conservation status, particularly of those most in decline, has been improved and sustained | **Aichi Target 12 is, appropriately, framed as an outcome target but requires rewording.**  **Key shortcomings:**  **The current target is entirely focused on threatened species** and doesn’t address the needs of **socioeconomically important species and other non-threatened species.** Socio-economically important species support livelihoods, the wildlife economy and the needs of indigenous people.  **The existing target 12 focuses only on preventing extinction**s, this means that parties may allow declines to a point where species are no longer functional and remain as the “living dead” no longer able to provide their ecological role in ecosystems or provide benefits to people.  Non-threatened species are key for maintaining ecological function. | **Option 1 and 2 both cater for monitoring the status of species**.  **We request a new focus that includes socio-economically important species**. Such a focus will meet South Africa and our fellow African countries’ dependence on healthy species populations **to support the wildlife economy.**  South Africa proposes a proposition rewording that promotes the outcome of retaining or where needed restoring healthy, ecologically functional and diverse species populations that **provide benefits** to people.  **Proposed elements of a new species target:**   * Prevent further decline of all known threatened and socio-economically important species. * Monitor and manage abundant species ensuring they do not decline beyond ecological thresholds and persist in ecological functioning landscapes. * Improve the status of 5% of known threatened species by 2030.   **Proposed indicators:**   * Trends in species’ extinction risk (i.e. the Red List Index of species survival). * Trends in the number of threatened and socio-economically important species that have stayed stable, experience genuine increase in risk of extinction, or genuine decrease in risk of extinction measured against that baseline of species assessed prior to 2020. * Trends in the abundance and occupancy of species (measured via the Living Planet Index). |
| 1. **Healthy ecosystems** –Addressing Ecosystem degradation and ecosystem integrity for terrestrial and marine ecosystems (including primary forests, soil ecosystems, wetlands, urban biodiversity, marine and coastal ecosystems, coral reefs, deep ocean sea beds, areas beyond national jurisdiction) | **No direct link to current Aichi target.**  Aichi 5 has indirect links to this but it is NOT an ecosystem status target it relates to biodiversity loss. There is no current Aichi target that captures ecosystem status, and this is one of the main reasons why South Africa sees value in Option 2.    There is a conceptual link to Aichi 15 (via the ecosystem degradation aspect) but this target has largely been interpreted as being focussed on carbon stocks. | **The Aichi framework lacks an outcome based indicator that reports on the status of ecosystems.**  **South Africa has successfully tracked the status of ecosystems in the marine, freshwater and terrestrial realms since 2004 and has supported other African parties to conduct ecosystem assessments.**  Given that Aichi Target 12 addresses outcomes linked to species diversity and Aichi Target 13 address outcomes linked to genetic diversity this omission of ecosystems as a key component of biodiversity is concerning. | **Option 1 does not have an ecosystem status indicator**. A broad ecosystem target similar to species target 12 should be added if Aichi model is to be updated rather than revised.  **Option 2: Shows promise for tracking ecosystem status**  A SMART ecosystem target is required in the post 2020 framework.  Possible wording could be:  **50% of all ecosystem types maintained in good / fair ecological condition.**  **Proposed indicators:**  The target could be tracked using ecosystem indicators that link to the IUCN RLE. While this is a relatively recent standard published in 2016, South Africa has supported data poor African countries (including Mozambique, Ethiopia, Botswana and Malawi) to assess ecosystem status for all ecosystem types and have managed to achieve baseline assessments in two years 2017-2019 using the IUCN RLE standard. This indicates strong potential for all countries to utilise this system if indicators linked to the IUCN RLE are included. |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | 1. **Genetic diversity is maintained** and its benefits are shared equitably | Aichi 13 - By 2020, the genetic diversity of cultivated plants and farmed and domesticated animals and of wild relatives, including other socioeconomically as well as culturally valuable species, is maintained, and strategies have been developed and  implemented for  minimizing genetic  erosion and  safeguarding their  genetic diversity. | **South Africa welcomes the focus in both Option 1 and 2 on maintaining genetic diversity and sharing benefits**.  **South Africa has identified wild relatives of cultivated crops and other socio-economically important species,**  The current Aichi 13 target does not consider those species not already identified as socioeconomically or culturally valuable to man – so only the genetic diversity of a minority of life on earth is covered by Aichi 13. Much of the socioeconomic value of existing genetic diversity is yet to be discovered, in which case it is important to conserve all genetic diversity, which will allow for benefits to in future be derived, and shared. We need to take a long term view rather than a real time snapshot of value from biodiversity. Further, this genetic diversity is contributing to delivery on ecosystem services and for that reason also needs to be maintained (is this aspect really considered and accommodated by Aichi target 14). | **Option 1 and 2 both address maintaining genetic diversity.**  Suggest rewording to:  Aichi 13 - By 2030, the genetic diversity of cultivated plants and farmed and domesticated animals **and all wild** species is maintained, and strategies have been developed and implemented for minimizing genetic erosion and safeguarding their genetic diversity. |
| 1. **Human health and well-being** enhancingthrough biodiversity(provisioning of ecosystem services maintained) | Aichi 14 - By 2020, ecosystems that provide essential services, including services related to water, and contribute to health, livelihoods and well -being, are restored and safeguarded, taking into account the needs of women, indigenous and local communities, and the poor and vulnerable. | **The existing target is hard to track due to lack of standardised indicators**.  **South Africa suggests the spatial mapping of areas that provide essential services.** South Africa has identified key “ecological infrastructure areas” for example Strategic Water Resource areas. | **Either option 1 or 2 will allow for provisioning of ecosystem services to be reflected and tracked.**  **For either option 1 or 2 the targets should explicitly include the term ecological infrastructure.** Ecological infrastructure is the nature-based equivalent of built or hard infrastructure, and is just as important as built infrastructure for providing services and underpinning socio-economic development.  **The use of the term ecological infrastructure has facilitated successful mainstreaming into economic sectors and national development planning.**  A standardised indicator post 2020 is needed that tracks retention and protection of Ecological Infrastructure and that aligns with natural capital accounting efforts. |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | 1. **Ecosystems are used sustainably** based on new consumption and production patterns   (Pollination, food security and nutrition, sustainable livelihoods, sustainable agriculture, genetic diversity of wild species, crop species and traditional varieties) | Aichi 4 - By 2020, at  the latest,  Governments, business  and stakeholders at all  levels have taken steps  to achieve or have  implemented plans for  sustainable production  and consumption and  have kept the impacts  of use of natural  resources well within  safe ecological limits  Aichi 7 - By 2020  areas under agriculture,  aquaculture and  forestry are managed  sustainably, ensuring  conservation of  biodiversity. | **We do not suggest adding genetic diversity under this target** as it will make it overly cumbersome. Rather leave this under element 3 (Genetic diversity is maintained and its benefits are shared equitably). | **Option 2 is preferred to Option 1 as it simplifies the two Aichi targets (4 &7) into one.**  We recommend elements of the existing targets 4, and 7 are turned into indicators.  As sustainable management of biological resources is closely linked to ecosystem condition we recommend that ecosystems that are utilised for human activities should be closely monitored using ecosystem condition indicators. |
| 1. **Biodiversity provides for nature-based solutions** for climate change and socio-economic development issues | Aichi 10 –  By 2015, the multiple anthropogenic pressures on coral reefs, and other vulnerable ecosystems impacted by climate change or ocean acidification are minimized, so as to maintain their integrity and functioning.  Aichi 15 - By 2020, ecosystem resilience and the contribution of biodiversity to carbon stocks has been enhanced, through conservation and restoration, including restoration of at least 15 per cent of degraded ecosystems, thereby contributing to climate change mitigation and adaptation and to combating desertification. | **It is important to include a target for unlocking nature based solutions for climate change** and this proposed target is therefore welcomed. | **Option 2 is preferred as it provides, in target 6, an opportunity to explicitly include targets that focus on nature based solutions to climate change as well as social and economic issues that promote such use.**  **Option 1:** While both current Aichi targets 10 and 15 provide climate change links, they focus on the impacts of climate change on biodiversity, and not the potential benefits of (well managed and well-functioning) biodiversity to provide nature based solutions to climate change induced shocks and other societal pressures.  Suggest elements of the former Aichi 15 are used to ensure this target is SMART. |
| **Goal B:** **Address biodiversity loss** | 1. **Address land use** (Deforestation, degradation, fragmentation and loss of primary ecosystems) | Aichi 5  By 2020, the  rate of loss of all  natural habitats,  including forests, is at  least halved and where  feasible brought close  to zero, and  degradation and  fragmentation is  significantly reduced | **It is very important that this element is framed to include all environments** (i.e. not land biased).  **It should be inclusive of habitat loss and degradation across all environments: marine, freshwater and terrestrial).** | **Option 1 - Aichi Target 5** is a very important **process** target for reporting national trends for habitat loss.  **However, Aichi 5 it has largely been interpreted as a “forest loss” target. With the current wording for option 2 this bias remains.**  For post 2020, it should be adjusted to emphasize that the rates of loss or reduction in condition of **all natural habitat**, and indicators should be developed accordingly.  **Indicators:** The Red List of Ecosystem based indicators linked to the proposed ecosystem target can be readily applied to Target 5. |
| 1. **Conserving** Land (key biodiversity areas Protected areas and other effective areas-based conservation measures, improving protected area management and governance, spatial planning, restoring ecosystem integrity) | Aichi 11 - By 2020, at  least 17 per cent of  terrestrial and inland  water, and 10 per cent  of coastal and marine  areas, especially areas  of particular importance for biodiversity and  ecosystem services, are  conserved through  effectively and equitably managed, ecologically  representative and well  connected systems of  protected areas and  other effective area based conservation  measures, and  integrated into the  wider landscapes and  seascapes | **Include marine in the definition for Option2.**  **South Africa supports using KBA networks as a component of the new protection target but warns that KBAS to not account for landscape connectivity** and specific indicators are needed to ensure connectivity remains a key element.  The use of Spatial Systematic Conservation Plans to identify Protected Area expansion is recommended. Countries can begin the process of spatial prioritisation using Key Biodiversity Areas as a minimum layer to support prioritisation of areas for protection.  **The emerging definitions for OECMs will strongly influence ability for parties to implement this new target.** | **An increased marine and terrestrial target is recommended** whether option 1 or option 2 are followed.  **Post 2020 refinement should be focussed on encouraging representation[[1]](#footnote-1) of ecosystem types in land and sea, and should aim to clarify the use of “Other Effective Conservation Measures”.**  Effectiveness of protection is also an issue and efforts to include Key Biodiversity Areas within the protection target are supported[[2]](#footnote-2).  **Indicators:**  An indicator that measures ecological representation is required. South Africa has successfully developed **an Ecosystem Protection Index** for use in the marine and terrestrial environment. This indicator has been successfully piloted in three other African countries: Ethiopia, Botswana and Malawi[[3]](#footnote-3).  The indicators focussed on Key Biodiversity Areas (that have been taken up into the SDGs) are also supported **but must be complemented by indicators that address connectivity.** |
| 1. **Address overexploitation** and **unsustainable consumption** (Food systems, energy systems, waste, infrastructure, production patterns, agriculture) | **No direct link to current Aichi target**  Indirect link to Aichi 4 -By 2020, at the latest, Governments, business and stakeholders at all levels have taken steps to achieve or have implemented plans for sustainable production and consumption and have kept the impacts of use of natural resources well within safe ecological limits | South Africa supports a focus on overexploitation and unsustainable consumption but requires this element to be further developed before we can provide meaningful comment. |  |
| 1. **Tackle unsustainable use and trade of wildlife, productive landscapes and seascapes** (Agriculture, Forestry, Fisheries) | Aichi 6 - By 2020 all fish and invertebrate stocks and aquatic plants are managed and harvested sustainably, legally and applying ecosystem based approaches, so that overfishing is avoided, recovery plans and measures are in place for all depleted species, fisheries have no significant adverse  impacts on threatened  species and vulnerable  ecosystems and the  impacts of fisheries on  stocks, species and  ecosystems are within  safe ecological limits. | **The current Aichi framework does not sufficiently tackle unsustainable utilisation** of terrestrial wildlife as the current Aichi 6 focuses on the unsustainable utilisation of marine species.  Indicators in the future framework that encourage parties to monitor the status of all utilised stocks is needed.[[4]](#footnote-4) | **If Option 1 is followed then the successor to Aichi 6 needs to address unsustainable use of all species in both the terrestrial and marine environment.** South Africa and many other African countries are heavily investing financial resources in preventing unsustainable use of wildlife we require that this is adequately addressed in the post 2020 framework.  **As option 2 already addresses unsustainable utilisation for species in all realms it is preferred.**  **South Africa encourages** the use of ecosystem approaches to support fisheries management. |
| 1. **Tackle pollution and toxic substances** (Plastics, pesticides, excessive nutrients, heavy metals, persistent organic pollutants, etc.) | Aichi 8 - By 2020,  pollution, including  from excess nutrients,  has been brought to  levels that are not detrimental to  ecosystem function and  biodiversity. | South Africa supports a focus on tackling pollution but requires this element to be further developed before we can provide meaningful comment.  There is close alignment of Aichi 8 with this suggested element of the new framework. | **Indicators:**  Better indicators are required for tracking reduction of pollution those suggested in <https://www.cbd.int/doc/decisions/cop-13/cop-13-dec-28-en.pdf> that link to SDG indicators only track impact on human health. The IUCN Red List Index could be used to track species documented to be threatened by pollution. |
| 1. **Reduce climate change impact on biodiversity (**Improve ecosystems’ capacity to adapt to the impacts of climate change) | Aichi 10 –  By 2015, the multiple anthropogenic pressures on coral reefs, and other vulnerable ecosystems impacted by climate change or ocean acidification are minimized, etc.  Aichi 15 - By 2020, ecosystem resilience and the contribution of biodiversity to carbon stocks has been enhanced, etc. | **Option 1:** **Aichi target 15 is primarily interpreted as a target to ‘restore ecosystem carbon’.** This abbreviation does not do justice to the full target which addressed ecosystem resilience as well carbon stocks**.** | **If Option 1 is followed a focus on retaining ecosystem resilience is required.**  There is great overlap in the two Aichi targets 10 and 15, and an opportunity for simplification exists. In this regard, **Option 2 is preferred.** |
| 1. **Action on biodiversity** a**ddress climate change** (restoration of degraded ecosystems, REDD+, nature-based solutions) | Aichi 10 –  By 2015, the multiple anthropogenic pressures on coral reefs, and other vulnerable ecosystems impacted by climate change or ocean acidification are minimized, so as to maintain their integrity and functioning.  Aichi 15 - By 2020, ecosystem resilience and the contribution of biodiversity to carbon stocks has been enhanced, through conservation and restoration, including restoration of at least 15 per cent of degraded ecosystems etc. | **In the proposed post 2020 wording, it is not clear what ‘Action on biodiversity address climate change’ means and these words should be amended so that what is intended is clear.**  Depending on what is intended, it appears as if targets 6 and 7 could be combined.  **The phrase ‘nature based solutions’ in the post 2020 target 7 is out of place here**, as the target seems to be about efforts towards improved biodiversity and ecosystem condition, and is not about the benefits that biodiversity / nature based solutions for provide people/ society. | **If option 2 is followed we suggest combining target 6 and 7.**  **Indicators:**  In order to measure progress on targets 7 spatially defined areas/ ecosystems that require restoration are needed.  Similarly for target 6 key ecosystems and areas needed to be maintained in good ecological condition to ensure resilience must be spatially identified and then monitored. |
| 1. **Address invasive alien species** | Aichi 9 - By 2020,  invasive alien species  and pathways are  identified and  prioritized, priority  species are controlled  or eradicated, and  measures are in place  to manage pathways to  prevent their  introduction and  establishment | **Aichi Target 9 focuses on the prioritisation of species for management, and on pathways of introduction for prevention.**  **A focus on priority biodiversity areas that are invaded is needed.**  South Africa feels there is a need to support global knowledge management systems to support invasives management including:   * Develop and document a global (could be regional as well) database of AIS data and information including descriptions of AIS. * Assist the development of standard global interventions to deal with AIS. Including control methods, regulatory initiatives, etc. | **Option 1 &2 both cater for Invasive Alien Species. However for whichever option is chosen the 2030 target needs to incorporate the prioritisation of vulnerable areas** in order to achieve the greatest conservation benefits. These vulnerable areas are sites that are important for the persistence of biodiversity and sensitive and susceptible to the impacts from IAS, and could include islands, protected areas, and Key Biodiversity Areas.  **The 2030 target should also focus on IAS that cause, or have the potential to cause, significant impacts,** which can now be identified using existing assessment schemes, such as the Environmental Impact Classification of Alien Taxa (EICAT), and the Socio-economic Impact Classification of Alien Taxa (SEICAT) developed by the IUCN ISSG (as requested by Parties to the CBD).  **Proposed target wording:** By 2030, 50% of invasive alien species causing significant impacts are regulated, 30% of the most significant pathways of introduction are effectively managed, and 50% of areas most vulnerable to the impacts from IAS have programmes in place that control or if feasible eradicate priority IAS, and prevent their introduction. |
| 1. **Address technological risks** | Aichi 13: By 2020,  the genetic diversity of  cultivated plants and  farmed and  domesticated animals  and of wild relatives,  including other socio  economically as well as  culturally valuable  species, is maintained,  and strategies have been developed and implemented for minimizing genetic  erosion and  safeguarding their  genetic diversity | South Africa has expertise to comment on the GMO component of this proposed target only.  **GMOs are one element of the biotechnological tools/methodologies for the different products that needs regulations towards the safeguarding of biodiversity.**  In addition, secondary elements to consider include pesticide resistance development, and impact of application of the products. | **Option 1 can be accommodated by the expansion of Target 13 to address issues around indigenous genetic resources and their potential harm from genetic erosion.**  **Not enough detail is yet available for option 2 to know what elements it will include. I**f pursued as a standalone target then the “risks” from the different technologies and products thereof will need to be clearly described/outlined.  Lack adequate indicators to measure or report on this target is currently challenging at both the species and the ecosystem level. |
| 1. **Address perverse incentives** | Aichi 3 - By 2020, at  the latest, incentives,  including subsidies,  harmful to biodiversity  are eliminated, phased out or reformed in order to minimize or avoid negative impacts, and positive incentives for the conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity are developed and applied, consistent and in harmony with the Convention and other relevant international obligations, taking into account national socioeconomic condition. | **Target 3 addresses both negative and positive incentives for the conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity.**  South Africa’s Biodiversity Tax Incentive that provides financial benefit to landowners declaring Protected Areas on their land is an example of a successful positive incentive. It is resulting in the effective protection of our Critical Biodiversity Areas, and closing the biodiversity finance gap for the sustainable persistence of protected areas across South Africa. | **Option 2 needs also to include the promotion of positive incentives.**  Identify suit of positive incentives that can be applied across sectors that would have positive biodiversity outcomes.  Introduce a programme of scoping across fiscal incentives to identify contradictions, unintended consequences and harmful subsidies in order to realign them. |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **GOAL C:** **Enabling actions and conditions** | 1. Establish good **governance** and provide political support for implementation (Multi-level governance and vertical integration) |  |  | Governance is essential to increase opportunities and attract financing and resourcing. There is a need to create cross sectoral platforms for integrated planning and implementation at local and national scales. |
| 1. Enhance **resource mobilization** and conservation financing (More effective and strategic use of resources, simpler procedures) | Aichi 20 – By 2020, at the latest, the mobilisation of financial resources for effectively implementing the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-202 from all sources, and in accordance with the consolidated and agreed process in the Strategy for Resource for Resource Mobilisation, should increase substantially from the current level. This target will be subject to changes contingent to resource needs assessment to be developed and reported by Parties. | Supporting the CBD’s definition of financing as creating new finance streams to achieve targets and the definition of resourcing as utilizing finances optimally with correct accountability. South Africa recommends that it is important that there are indicators for each of these to ensure that they both receive due focus.  South Africa recommends that we learn from countries that have progressed in finding innovative financing options, lessons from Biofin countries need to captured and shared. | Current strategies need to be reviewed to identify the financing gap.  We recommend that post2020 all strategies produced in the sector are fully costed and integrated into medium term expenditure frameworks and NDPs, and include cost efficiencies as part of resource optimisation.  There is a need to develop a strategic and holistic approach to addressing biodiversity finance.  The potential for the circular economy to contribute to resource mobilisation should be explored. |
| 1. Effective communication and public awareness (Clear messaging and simpler communication, values of biodiversity, increase resources available) | Aichi 1- By 2020, at the latest, people are aware of the values of biodiversity and the steps they can take to conserve and use it sustainably. |  | Sophisticated advocacy mechanisms should be included, that are tracked and monitored for impact over time. |
| 1. Engagement with indigenous peoples and local communities, civil society organizations, youth, women’s groups and the private sector (Traditional knowledge and customary sustainable use, indigenous peoples and local communities conserved territories and areas and sacred natural sites, territorial and land tenure rights of indigenous peoples and local communities, free prior and informed consent and mutually agreed terms) | Aichi 18- By 2020, the traditional knowledge, innovations and practices of indigenous and local communities relevant for the conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity, and their customary use of biological resources; are respected, subject to national legislation and relevant international obligations, and fully integrated and reflected in implementation of the Convention with the full and effective participation of indigenous and local communities, at all relevant levels. | South Africa has a wealth of experience around socio-ecological systems thinking available, particularly out of our natural resource management work that could be shared. |  |
| 1. Incorporate gender (Contribution and participation of women in biodiversity conservation and restoration) | Not included as a standalone target in current Strategic Plan for Biodiversity. | South Africa supports a focus gender representation but requires this element to be further developed before we can provide meaningful comment. | We do question if there needs to be a standalone target, would this not make the new framework unnecessarily long, could there not be a combined target on representing indigenous people, local communities and women for the post202 framework? |
| 1. Mainstreaming of biodiversity in key sectors (agriculture, forestry, fisheries, aquaculture, tourism, energy and mining, infrastructure, manufacturing and processing sectors) | Aichi 2 – By 2020, at the latest, biodiversity values have been integrated into national and local development and poverty reduction strategies and planning processes and are being incorporated into national accounting, as appropriate, and reporting systems. | South Africa welcomes the stronger focus in Option 2 of mainstreaming into specific development sectors. A successor to the Aichi target 2 must incorporate mainstreaming into development sectors. | South Africa has many years of experience it is able to offer to facilitate learning around the mainstreaming of biodiversity. Some of this learning speaks to the length of time that it takes to effectively mainstream, meaning that long term resourcing is necessary for the success of mainstreaming efforts.  Efforts should be made to also mainstream in to banking and finance sectors.  The potential that Natural Capital Accounting presents to mainstreaming across sectors should be explored. |
| 1. Implementation of the Nagoya and Cartagena Protocols (biosafety and access and benefit‑sharing) | Aichi 16- By 2015, the Nagoya Protocol on Access to Genetic Resources and the Fair and Equitable Sharing of Benefits Arising from their Utilisation is in force and operational, consistent with national legislation. | **Option 2 shows promise for tracking the contribution of ABS to genetic diversity maintenance.**  To date South African implementation on the Nagoya Protocol has so far not linked direct biodiversity conservation of SA’s genetic resources to the equitable sharing of benefits, only indirect conservation based on the notion that communities better conserve biodiversity when they benefit from it. Such indirect benefits for biodiversity conservation remain unsubstantiated. Targets that link equitable and fair sharing of benefits to biodiversity conservation really do need to be SMART, as this objective in the CBD currently has many ambiguities. There is a real danger globally that the inappropriate servicing of this third and ill-defined objective leads to delivery on socio-economic and political objectives at the expense of gains for biodiversity conservation. | A SMART ABS-linked conservation target is required in the post 2020 framework.  Possible wording could be:  **50% of all financial ABS benefits shared through use of genetic resources is directly deployed for biodiversity conservation.**  **Proposed indicators:**  Standardised indicators for biodiversity conservation at various levels (genes, species, ecosystems) can be used. |
| 1. Enhance capacity-building, scientific and technical cooperation (Technology transfer and south-south cooperation, technological solutions to biodiversity loss) | Aichi 19 – By 2020, knowledge, the science base and technologies relating to biodiversity, its values, functioning, status and trends, and the consequences of its loss, are improved, widely shared and transferred and applied. | **South Africa has played a role in regional capacity building activities,** for example with support from the CBD’s Japanese Biodiversity Fund established in Nagoya in 2010 we have supported other African parties (Malawi, Ethiopia and Botswana) to produce essential biodiversity spatial data on ecosystems types, ecosystem condition and protected areas to produce a national ecosystem assessment that is currently being used in national development planning and to supporting mainstreaming activities within key largescale infrastructure development projects. Similar work is being initiated with Mozambique and Kenya. | **Include in target wording providing the key science based knowledge products needed to guide the implementation of this framework.**  **Include as indicators the development of spatial data and the production of systematic biodiversity conservation plans** to facilitate efficient implementation of the framework especially the prioritisation of areas for protection and retention / restoration of ecosystem provisioning services.  Capacity development for managing projects and resource mobilisation should be included.  For all targets developed for the new framework we suggest mechanisms for national implementation are included with links to guidance documents. Where relevant offers of technical support from international institutions should be included. |

1. South Africa has made significant strides towards meeting the current target including the recent expansion of marine protected areas from 0.4% to 5% (of South Africa’s marine territory and EEZ) through the declaration of 20 new protected areas. The careful planning processes followed have resulted in a highly efficient MPA network with high ecosystem representation, with 87% of marine ecosystem types represented in a MPA network covering 5% of the ocean area. [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. Visconti BP, Butchart SHM, Brooks TM et al. (2019) Protected area targets post-2020. Science, 364, 239–241. [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
3. This work was supported via the CBD Japan Biodiversity Fund and shared via the [NBSAP Forum](http://nbsapforum.net/sites/default/files/NBSAP%20Forum%20Mapping%20Biodiversity%20Priorities%20Webinar.pdf) (see [Mapping Biodiversity Priorities](https://www.sanbi.org/wp-content/uploads/2018/04/mapping-biodiversity-priorities-web.pdf)). [↑](#footnote-ref-3)
4. South African marine resource use falls far short of this with many stocks not assessed, more than 30% of assessed resources being overexploited and inshore resources in crisis. [↑](#footnote-ref-4)