

Proposal from the Collaborative Partnership on Sustainable Wildlife Management

The considerations of CPW to date (primarily at the Workshop on Sustainable Wildlife Management Beyond 2020, the report of which is available: [CBD/WG2020/1/INF/3](#)) focussed primarily on the wildlife use and trade target(s) for the post-2020 Global Biodiversity Framework.

It was also recognized at the workshop that separate target(s) may be recommended for addressing the issue of human-wildlife conflict. No specific discussion outcomes were captured during the workshop, but the language for the **potential post-2020 target on human-wildlife conflict** was discussed by the IUCN SSC Human-Wildlife Conflict Task Force at its meeting in July 2019, and included in Annex of the workshop report (see it below).

Wildlife trade and use as an issue at the nexus of today's most pressing conservation and development concerns linked to human use of natural resources. The trade in wild animals and plants contributes to the livelihoods of hundreds of millions of people around the world and generates hundreds of billions of dollars of economic value annually. However, all too often, efforts to ensure this trade remains legal and at sustainable levels struggle to succeed. This jeopardises the status of species, ecosystems and the well-being of people who depend on wild resources for their livelihood.

Poaching, illegal logging, and other types of wildlife crime have been particularly severe in Asia, Africa and Latin America, where wildlife populations are under extreme pressure due to growing demand, particularly from markets in Asia. Well-known species such as elephants, rhinos and tigers remain at risk, with poaching for trade also threatening a wide variety of other fauna including pangolins and species of reptiles, and birds. Not only terrestrial animal species are threatened by illegal activities, with a growing number of timber and plant species, marine fish and other aquatic species also illegally targeted to supply markets including in Asia, the USA, and Europe. As a result, over recent years the issue of wildlife trade has been brought to the forefront of global attention, at the highest level of government. In July 2015, the UN General Assembly adopted its first-ever Resolution on Tackling Illicit Trafficking in Wildlife (69/314) and this was followed by numerous commitments on wildlife trade being adopted by individual countries at the highest political levels, as well as co-operative strategies and plans to address wildlife trade adopted by regional economic integration organisations and other regional bodies.

For many species, the impacts of illegal trade are compounded by legal but unsustainable trade linked to a **wider lack of good governance and effective management, as well as persistent and systemic corruption** in the area of natural resources management.

The **Aichi biodiversity Targets in the CBD's Strategic Plan to 2020 do not include a target specific to trade in wildlife**, despite illegal and unsustainable trade being one of the key drivers of biodiversity loss, and sustainable, well-managed legal wildlife trade having a scope for providing benefits to all from biodiversity and ecosystem services. Selected Aichi Targets (for example Target 6 concerning fish, invertebrate stocks and aquatic plants), as well as the Targets of the CBD's Global Strategy for Plant Conservation, recognise and reflect on the importance of addressing illegal and unsustainable trade in species of wild flora and fauna. The relevant areas of work in CBD include Sustainable Use of Biodiversity, Forest, Health and Biodiversity, Global Strategy for Plant Conservation, Business and Biodiversity, among others.

While the commitments of **CBD Parties concern the issues of national jurisdiction, in the current set-up of the global biodiversity targets, the impacts of trade on biodiversity in other countries is poorly covered**. Such impacts on biodiversity outside national borders are exemplified by international wildlife trade currently lacking the commitment to implement measures to ensure trade is legal and sustainable at the global level. While certain other Multilateral Environmental Agreements—in particular the Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species of Wild Fauna and Flora (CITES) and the Convention on the Conservation of Migratory Species of Wild Animals (CMS)—address elements of wildlife trade, **wider commitment under the umbrella of the global biodiversity framework is needed, including to provide the direct link to the implementation of the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development**.

The 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development and the accompanying Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) and Targets has renewed policy attention on sustainable use of marine and terrestrial ecosystems (SDGs 14 and 15), sustainable production and consumption (SDG 12), and provided a framework for measuring progress. It also helped reinforce similar commitments to ensuring sustainable natural resource use is reflected in a wide range of intergovernmental, national and private sector policies. Of specific direct relevance to wildlife trade is SDG 15.7: *“Take urgent action to end poaching and trafficking of protected species of flora and fauna, and address both demand and supply of illegal wildlife products”*

Following this overall consensus on the need for an expression of target(s) concerning wildlife use and trade, a number of different ideas for targets emerged from discussions to take forward into the post-2020 global biodiversity framework:

By 2030, legal use and trade of wild fauna and flora¹ at sustainable levels enhances the conservation of biodiversity and the benefits to human well-being (supporting Strategic Goal D)

By 2030, the pressure of illegal and unsustainable use and trade in wild fauna and flora² is reduced, contributing to the conservation of biodiversity and human well-being (supporting Strategic Goal B)

Following the definition of potential targets, a variety of approaches were discussed that can be taken to develop a set of **measurable goals**, to be underpinned by a set of indicators. It was suggested that such measurements will be possible by **linking to priority / key species indicative and representative of changes and progress in wildlife use and trade**.

Potential Targets	How to measure these targets? For example:
By 2030, legal use and trade of wild fauna and flora at sustainable levels enhances the conservation of biodiversity and the benefits to human well-being	Best practice guidelines (e.g. FairWild Standard) are applied to trade in 50 priority wild plant value chains (and number of people benefitting from equitable trade)
	CBD Voluntary guidance for a sustainable wild meat sector (Decision 14/7) is applied to selected key wildlife species in use and trade and by key tropical and sub-tropical countries
	Robust traceability mechanisms established for high risk wild species of fauna and flora in trade
	For CITES-listed species of flora and fauna, increase in a number of Appendix I down-listing and decrease in CITES compliance interventions
	Species management plans are developed for key used and traded wild species of fauna and flora in trade
	Measurable increase in the number of people relying on and benefitting from sustainable use and trade in species of wild fauna and flora
By 2030, the pressure of illegal and unsustainable use and trade in wild fauna and flora is reduced, contributing to the conservation of biodiversity and human well-being	Illegal trade in elephants, rhino, and tiger products reduced by 50%
	Unauthorized timber exports reduced by 50% or more from countries with significant illegal trade from high conservation value forests
	Risk of overexploitation reduced by 30% for “high risk” shark species in trade

Further refinement of the targets and measurable goals will be required to reach an agreement, but it appeared that there will be goals and indicators to underpin such targets.

Additional work is required to confirm the level of ambition for the post-2020 targets as expressed in the measurable goals, as the examples given may not be ambitious enough to ‘bend the curve’.

¹ The issue of whether ‘fungi’ should be included in the language of the potential targets was brought up at the review stage, however not captured during the workshop discussion

² *Ibid*

It was also observed that coordination is needed with the organizations and stakeholders leading on the measurement of progress of Aichi Target 6 (Sustainable Fisheries), to integrate the information.

Workshop participants discussed the data sets available to underpin the targets discussed (see Annex 3 of the Workshop proceedings report). It was also observed that further research is needed into the data sets available on human dependence, as well as people benefitting from wildlife use and trade.

Potential Targets	How to measure these targets? For example:
By 2030, human-wildlife conflicts, (i.e. conflicts over wildlife, arising from negative impacts on livelihoods caused by wildlife, and associated retaliatory or preventative persecution of the blamed species) is reduced globally by 50%	A global study of the extent of HWC carried out in 2020 is repeated in 2030, showing a quantifiable reduction in HWC via several social, economic and ecological indicators
	Countries have detailed HWC management strategies and policies incorporated into their NBSAPs or other national policies
	Capacity among governments, NGOs, communities and other conservation actors to manage HWCs has increased significantly
	Resources directed towards HWC management has increased significantly, including a focus on planning for emerging HWCs
	IUCN Guidelines on HWC are widely accepted and followed as a guiding standard for effective HWC management by governments, NGOs and conservation professionals

Potential post-2020 target on human-wildlife conflict (outcome of the IUCN SSC Human-Wildlife Conflict Task Force meeting, July 2019)