United Nations University Institute for the Advanced Study of Sustainability (UNU-IAS) Response to CBD Notification 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

Prepared by UNU-IAS, February 2020

Note: Because UNU-IAS has already submitted views on related topics in response to previous calls for submissions to the post-2020 process, we will limit our comments here specific comments on the "Action Targets" and the Appendix to the Zero Draft of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework.

Targets:

General:

- Targets 1-16 are more or less SMART, but 17-20 are not. This unevenness was one of the problems with the Aichi Targets and must be improved this time.
- Some targets overlap too much, especially 14 and 17, which both cover mainstreaming in economic sectors. Some of these could be combined.
- There should be a target on aligning biodiversity policy with SDGs and related conventions.
- "Nature-based solutions", being a new concept in the biodiversity policy community, could be in one target, and the focus should be on biodiversity. Sub-targets or indicators could cover specifics like water provision, DRR contributions, mangrove restoration, etc.

Individual Targets:

Targets 1 and 2:

- These are overlapping, both being about spatial planning.
- To split up these spatial planning aspects in a way that makes more sense: one target should cover restoration; and another should cover protected areas:
  - Target 1: [x% or x hectares] of degraded areas are restored in a way that is beneficial to biodiversity
  - Target 2: The whole earth's surface is covered by comprehensive spatial planning emphasizing biodiversity, with [x%] covered by protected areas, OECMs, sustainable-use zones, etc., also emphasizing connectivity and integration into the landscape.
- Also: 100 percent of area should be covered by "comprehensive spatial planning"! Just being part of a land-use plan does not necessarily mean being in a protected area. Every country should have a comprehensive, biodiversity-friendly plan for their land use, including protected areas, land-use change, productive activities, etc. Even if the plan includes some deforestation, etc., it should be done in line with planning and policy.
- The target(s) on spatial planning should clearly recognize Nature as a whole, as connected ecosystems rather than ecological sectorization, and give more emphasis on the importance of land-sea connectivity. The "landscape approach" is one of the effective ways to achieve this kind of truly comprehensive spatial planning.

Target 4:

- Baseline and base year should be specified.
- Should ensure synergies with efforts under other Conventions but should avoid overlaps.
- Appendix:
  - Pollution could be derived from factories, power plants and many others but the targets for monitoring seem to be limited.
  - Change in amount of other pollutants (including light and noise): Light pollution is affecting reproduction of species including fireflies, which is leading to change in food chain and affecting the biodiversity of the land. Treating the very different types of pollutions, such as light, noise, and pollutions other than those separately listed, together may not be helpful in measuring targets or taking actions.
  - "effective" waste management plans – how to determine effectiveness is unclear.
  - Pollution management programmes and policies cannot be measured by waste management plans alone. Need to include laws and regulations on chemical control.

Target 5:

- This target overlaps too much with Target 7. One idea would be to limit Target 5 to harvesting and trade, and make Target 7 about sustainable use.
- This should be "all species, including wild species".
- The target is not clear if it is only focusing on animals or intends to include plants.
- Appendix:
  - Mixing fish harvesting with forest management and then covering fisheries is confusing and should be streamlined.
  - The term "Health of fisheries" is not clear.
  - "Percentage of fisheries under sustainable management certification" is an indicator not a target.
  - "Change in the impacts of the harvest, trade and use of biological resources on biodiversity"- very vague and broad. Not clear what Parties should be aiming for.

Target 6:

- As written, this is not a biodiversity target. If there is a quantifiable element here, it should be about biodiversity, not percentage of Paris Agreement goals. This could be about aligning biodiversity with climate and DRR policies, and maybe others, but it should not be about contributions to other processes:
  - Suggestion: "Biodiversity-related policy at all levels is aligned with policies related to climate change, disaster-risk reduction, (etc.), such that nature-based solutions* (in the form of protected areas, green infrastructure, key ecosystems, etc.) contributes at least [x%] of the mitigation effort needed to achieve the goals of the Paris Agreement, [x%] of the efforts called for under the Sendai Framework, (etc.)"
    - * It is of vital importance that these "nature-based solutions" means biodiversity-friendly ones with safeguards. A monocultural forest planted just to soak up carbon dioxide is not biodiversity-friendly, although it may be recognized as a nature-based solution by some.
    - Nature based solutions should be defined clearly. Various initiatives and examples are listed but definition on what it needs to entail to be called a Nature-based solution should be clear as part of the framework.

Target 7:

- As written, this covers essentially the same content as Target 5, only it seems to say that the use of wild species should be *increased* ("enhanced"). This is the opposite of what should be the goal! Targets 5 and 7 should somehow be combined or clarified.
  - Suggestion: "Ensure that the sustainable use of biodiversity, including wild species, provides benefits including increased nutrition, food security, and livelihoods for at least [x million] people…"

Target 8:

- Appendix:
  - Not clear what this "productivity gaps" refers to. Without this term being clearly defined, the target number has no use.
  - Not clear what "benefits" are referred to in "trends in pollinators and benefits".
  - Aquaculture should be included here.

Target 9:

- As written, this is not a biodiversity goal. The emphasis for all Biodiversity Targets should be on biodiversity, with benefits like water coming out of that goal.
  - Suggestion: "Develop and implement biodiversity-friendly and locally-appropriate 'green infrastructure' and other nature-based solutions that provide benefits from biodiversity such that these provide, among others, clean water for at least [x million] people."

Target 10:

- Rather than increasing the proportion of such people, it may be better to make the target that [x%] of people have access (an outcome rather than a process). Ideally, the percentage of people who have access would be 100%.
  - Suggestion: "Incorporate biodiversity-rich green spaces or, as locally appropriate, other places of natural beauty, into all human-inhabited landscapes, especially for urban dwellers, for their health and well-being benefits, such that by 2030 [100%] of people have access to such spaces."
- Appendix:
  - It will be necessary to define "easy access". Easy access can mean public transportation is developed so that access to natural environments become "easier" but not necessarily nature being built or restored near people. If the intention is to increase urban green space, "easy access" should be reconsidered.

Target 11:

- "[x] increase in benefits" from these is not a measurable quantity. This target should be reworded to clarify what it is calling for, and what this increase in benefits means in concrete terms.
- "Utilization of genetic resources, and related traditional knowledge" covers too broad a concept. Utilization of genetic resources does not necessarily relate to traditional knowledge.
- "Fair and equitable sharing of benefits" and "increase in benefits" are two different concepts and should be simplified into a clear target.

3

Target 14:

- This overlaps very heavily with Target 17, on sustainable production and consumption. These could be combined into one target on mainstreaming in sectors, or else it should be made clear how "economic sectors" differs from "consumption and production".
- Not clear what is aimed to be reduced and how. If aiming to set a numerical target, the description of "negative impacts on biodiversity" is too vague. Current elements do not seem to be able to measure such a target.

Target 15:

- Setting the goal as X % of resources increase alone do not necessarily help as the efficient use of resources and how best the right amount of resources go to the right area and activities that determine the success.
- It is also not clear how to measure an increase in 'capacity building'.
- Appendix:
    - "Change in expenditure on biodiversity" – it is important to make sure that more money is going into biodiversity because of increased effective efforts towards conservation, not just because the rate of degradation is higher.

Target 17:

- Unlike other targets, this is not a national-scale target, but focuses on individual choices and lifestyle. This is not the appropriate focus for a UN decision, as it is the national Parties that will be implementing the framework. This should be reformulated into a national target, and must also emphasize biodiversity.
- Also, this should include trade, as it is a major driver.
    - Suggestion: "Promote and, where appropriate, mandate sustainable production, consumption, trade, and lifestyles, so that by 2030 there is no net biodiversity loss created by these. Develop and implement policies in every country that ensure this."

Target 18:

- This is too vague and broad, and impossible to implement. CEPA should be integrated into the targets in an explicit and action-oriented way.
    - Suggestion: "Integrate Communications, Education, and Public Awareness related to biodiversity into all levels of policy. By 2030, education on biodiversity is included in compulsory education curricula, and Public-Awareness campaigns are carried out, in all countries. Where appropriate, traditional knowledge, innovations and practices of indigenous peoples and local communities are included in CEPA, with their free, prior and informed consent, ensuring by 2030 that all citizens and decision makers have access to reliable and up-to-date information for the effective management of biodiversity."

Target 19:

- "Promote" is not strong enough of an action-oriented target for inclusion.
    - Suggestion: "Develop an effective mechanism in all Parties' national policy for equitable, full, and effective participation of indigenous peoples and local communities, women, and youth in decision-making, and rights over relevant resources, related to the conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity."

Target 20:

- This is much too vague and meaningless. What is this target even supposed to mean? It seems it is an attempt to integrate social or cultural aspects and broaden the scope of biodiversity in society as a whole, but as written it is not clear. In this case, it would be better to explicitly say what this means for policy.
    - Suggestion: "Align biodiversity policy with policies related to society as a whole to create synergies between nature and culture. By 2030, as part of their national policy commitments under the CBD, Parties demonstrate how nature is integrated with policy related to urban planning, cultural heritage, human health and well-being, and others."

Indicators:

The following is a very incomplete list of some suggested potential indicators, considering the changes to the targets listed above.

Target 2 (protected areas):

- Area covered by protected areas
- Area covered by OECMs
- Area managed with high habitat diversity according to the "Satoyama Index" (sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0167880910002963)
- Number (or area) of recognized cultural landscapes, historical landscapes, and the like
- Number of bio-corridors
- Number or proportion of protected areas with comprehensive planning beyond their borders including buffer zones and corridors
- Number of land-use policies that demonstrably integrate a "ridge-to-reef" landscape approach
- Agricultural area covered by certified biodiversity-friendly agricultural methods
- Agricultural area covered by fields incorporating berms, buffers, and other industry-standard biodiversity-friendly spatial planning measures
- Agricultural area covered by mechanisms to explicitly encourage agricultural biodiversity
- Disaggregated data on spatial planning policies by scale: global-scale, national-scale, landscape-scale, etc.

Target 4:

- Agricultural area covered by pesticide- and fertilizer-free agricultural methods
- Not only the amount of pesticide used, but the type and frequency of use per area should be measured. The amount alone could be misleading because if the agricultural area is reduced, so could the pesticides.
- Laws and regulations in place for controlling the use of harmful pesticides and synthetic fungicide

Target 5:

- Change in the health of fisheries and change in percentage of fisheries under sustainable management certification could be combined. The latter is an indicator of health of fisheries.

Target 6:

- Percentage of countries with NBS included in Nationally Determined Contributions- this could be helpful in viewing the trends but percentage of countries alone does not help in concrete terms, unless the concept of NBS is agreed and implemented safeguarding biodiversity
- Amount of GHG mitigation and reduction coming from NBS in national plans, including how to measure the amount of GHG reduction that is solely from NBS. Parties need to have common agreed understanding of NBS.

Target 7:

- Estimates of value of medicinal plants: It is not clear how this could be an indicator for change in benefits. This is probably helpful to know but if the estimated value of medicinal

plants, for example, increase or decrease, it is not clear if it means the amount available has been increased or decreased, or new scientific findings or invention led to increased value.

- Definition and examples of "human-wildlife conflict" needs to be agreed to be used as indicator.

Target 9

- Elements for targets for monitoring includes elements that are not related to biodiversity

Target 12:

- Subsidies for pesticides use and fertilizer use: It will be necessary to clarify if it is considered positive for governments to promote organic pesticides and fertilizer over synthetics. Grouping all pesticides and fertilizer use as negative are not realistic and not necessarily helpful.

Target 13:

- Elements could include "national reporting system that incorporates biodiversity values"

Target 15:

- Disaggregated data on mobilization of resources other than money, including knowledge, technology, and human resources

Target 17:

- Economic value of traded products that are produced under biodiversity-related certification schemes
- Economic value of biodiversity-based products produced in women's-controlled industries, including informal and cottage industries

Target 18:

- Number of students taught about biodiversity and its importance in school curricula
- Number of people reached through public-awareness campaigns on biodiversity
- Number of large-scale and small-scale scientific assessments of biodiversity whose results are reported to CBD parties under CBD processes
- Number of specific instances of traditional and local knowledge being incorporated into conservation and sustainable use policy

Target 19:

- Number of national and sub-national policies developed during the timeframe of the framework where IPLCs, women, and youth were demonstrably included in the development process
- Number of IPLC-controlled landscapes managed under biodiversity-friendly management practices
- Number of documented cases of community-based monitoring of biodiversity
- Number of "biocultural community protocols" as recognized under the Nagoya Protocol
- (negative indicator) Area of land where women are legally denied land tenure rights
- (negative indicator) Area of land where IPLCs are legally denied land tenure rights

Target 20:

- Number of national and sub-national policy instruments on culture and society that explicitly mention biodiversity
- Number of national and sub-national policy instruments on biodiversity that explicitly mention its cultural value

(New) Target on alignment with SDGs and related conventions:

- Number of decisions from other conventions and related bodies that specifically mention biodiversity as a priority
- Number of development projects under UNDP and SDG processes explicitly emphasizing biodiversity
- Conversely, number of CBD decisions explicitly emphasizing priorities of related conventions and processes