



Responses to CBD discussion paper on the post-2020 biodiversity framework

April 2019

This note presents IIED responses to the questions raised in the CBD discussion paper. We have not responded to all the questions posed – our responses below reflect the issues on which we feel we have experience and expertise to comment and are most relevant to our agenda of a fair and sustainable world.

A. Structure: What could constitute an effective structure for the post-2020 global biodiversity framework, what should its different elements be, and how should they be organized (eg a pyramid, something like the SDGs, something different?)

The UNFCCC Paris Agreement has one overarching target to limit the global average temperature rise to no more than 2 degrees centigrade above pre-industrial levels. The post-2020 framework needs a similar apex target or targets, underpinned by intermediary targets. A pyramid structure would work well in reflecting this approach.

B. Ambition: What would “ambitious” specifically mean for the post 2020 framework?

Ambitious means seeking transformative change. This means tackling the underlying drivers of biodiversity loss rather than just tackling the symptoms – tackling both systemic drivers as well as site-level threats. Two of the most important drivers (both of which will be exacerbated by climate change) are growing food demand leading to agricultural expansion and over-fishing and hunting (thus requiring action on consumption as well as production) and poor governance (thus requiring action on power relations), in particular ensuring that those who have the most to lose from loss of biodiversity and ecosystem services have a strong voice in decision-making. People who have most to lose are poor people and indigenous peoples and local communities (IPLCs) who are highly dependent on biodiversity and climate-vulnerable ecosystem services, and who have legitimate rights to a safe and healthy environment. These stakeholders/rightsholders may have different priorities for biodiversity conservation than international conservation organisations. This may mean prioritising components of biodiversity that underpin ecosystem health and climate change resilience as much as iconic species.

Given that a large proportion of biodiversity is located on indigenous peoples' territories and that these territories play a crucial role as carbon sinks, in sustaining genetic diversity for

adaptation and in sustaining livelihoods, ensuring that indigenous peoples' rights to land are protected is vital for biodiversity conservation.

However the CBD has sought to be ambitious before – and failed. The 2010 target of reversing biodiversity loss was not achieved. Achieving change requires being ambitious in terms of taking practical steps to engage mainstream sectors as actively and early as possible in the process, allowing them to shape biodiversity targets and giving them leadership responsibility for achieving targets. In particular, this means being serious about engagement at the highest levels of government and the private sector to significantly raise the political profile of biodiversity loss and ensure it is treated as seriously as climate change.

C. 2050 Vision: The current Vision “Living in harmony with nature” is considered to be still relevant but needs clarifying. What, in real terms, does “living in harmony” with nature entail, what are the implications of this for the scope and content of the post-2020 framework and what actions are needed between now and 2050 to reach the 2050 Vision?

The Living in Harmony vision seems – in 2019 – to be an overly simplistic concept that ignores the complexity of competing interests and rights and unsustainability of much of what society does. The vision needs to reflect different perspectives of what harmony looks like. The IPBES framework seeks to recognise different worldviews on biodiversity and nature and should be reflected by the CBD. Living in harmony with nature implies at least doing no harm or minimum harm – this has far reaching implications for agriculture and natural resource sectors, development planning, transport etc. It means changing policies and practices across economic sectors to reduce or eliminate adverse impacts and enable transition to a green economy. It also means giving indigenous peoples and local communities who have been living in harmony with nature for centuries the support they need to continue sustainable lifestyles – eg. recognition of land and resource rights, removing perverse incentives, support for culturally-sensitive economic development and for community-led conservation. Living in Harmony also needs to reflect concepts of sustainability and intragenerational fairness/equity. We suggest that people need to be emphasised more strongly in the Vision eg “A fair/equitable and sustainable world where there is harmony between nature and people”

D. Mission: What would be the elements and content of an actionable 2030 mission statement?

The mission statement should include a clear and actionable target that describes a goal or state we want to achieve by 2030 – like the Paris Agreement of keeping to no more than 2 degrees temperature rise – as an interim point to the 2050 vision. Halting biodiversity loss is not an appropriate mission since biodiversity loss is a natural process. However it is the current *rate* of loss that needs to be changed while the evolutionary potential of the planet is safeguarded.

It is also important that the mission recognises that the *process* of conservation is critical. It should emphasise the need for approaches to conservation that are fair/equitable as well as ecologically effective.

As with the Vision, it should reflect people's dependency on biodiversity, the potential for sustainable use to generate both ecological and social benefits, and the crucial role of local

biodiversity stewards. It should also emphasise the responsibilities of all sectors of society in achieving it. A mission statement reflecting these components would be worded along the lines of “working with civil society, the private sector, governments and international agencies to reduce biodiversity loss, through fair/equitable approaches to conservation and sustainable use, to no more than X% above natural background rates”. The X% should be based on sound science and be ambitious but at the same time realistic.

E. Targets:

a. What does “SMART” targets mean in practical terms?

SMART targets mean that the targets have SMART indicators – ie measurable, realistic, time-bound etc etc. The indicators could reflect steps towards 2030 – ie they should be iterative and be achieved progressively between 2020 and 2030. In addition to being measurable and timebound, the targets need to move on from stating what needs to be halted, reversed and reduced to providing clarity on *how* they should be achieved and *who* should be responsible.

b. How should the set of targets in the new framework relate to existing Aichi Biodiversity Targets?

The new targets can build on the Aichi targets but also should be aligned with the SDGs. Existing Aichi targets should be updated in light of assessments of progress towards their achievement – and should focus on tackling the main gaps and constraints to their achievement. Traditional knowledge, participation of indigenous peoples, human and indigenous rights and gender should be integrated across the targets as cross-cutting issues.

Some key issues are notable by their absence from the current Aichi Targets. For example, despite ‘sustainable use of biodiversity’ being one of the three Objectives of CBD, illegal and unsustainable trade being one of the key drivers of biodiversity loss (so should be mentioned in B), and sustainable, wildlife management having the potential to benefit both people and conservation, there is currently no target on sustainable use. Other biodiversity conventions and the SDGs address legal and illegal use and trade in wildlife, and this needs to be reflected in the new Strategic Plan.

c. How should the set of targets in the new framework align with other global targets, including the SDGs?

The targets should make reference to, and be coordinated with:

- Biodiversity-related conventions: the current strategic plan serves as a framework for cooperation amongst the biodiversity -related conventions including CITES, CMS, Ramsar and ITPGR and has been recognized by the United Nations General Assembly. The new framework should extend this cooperation to other biodiversity-related conventions including the new oceans treaty on *Biodiversity Beyond National Jurisdiction*.
- Rio conventions: the links between biodiversity conservation, land degradation and climate change must be recognised in the post-2020 framework with coordination (aligned targets) ensured between CBD, UNFCCC and UNCCD as well as the New York Declaration on Forest, Bonn Challenge, Trillion Trees Partnership, etc.

- **SDGs:** Many of the Aichi targets are reflected in the SDGs but expire in 2020, while the SDGs run to 2030. The new framework must be fully aligned to the SDGs, not just including targets where biodiversity contributes to the fulfilment of specific goals, but also mitigating actions where achievement of specific SDGs might present a threat to biodiversity. In addition to updated, SDG-compatible targets, the new framework should be aligned time-wise with the SDGs – ie expiring in 2030. SDG targets that currently mirror Aichi targets and expire in 2020 should be updated to reflect the new post-2020 targets
- **Human Rights conventions:** Both biodiversity loss and exclusionary conservation measures can infringe human rights (both now and into the future); while the recognition of human and indigenous rights is important to support continued stewardship of biodiversity. The new framework should reflect the Knox framework principles on the right to a safe, clean, healthy and sustainable environment, as well as the commitments made in the UN Declaration of the Rights of Indigenous Peoples, the Convention of Discrimination Against Women (CEDAW) and the Convention on the Rights of the Child (UNCRC).
- **Culture related conventions of UNESCO:** The new framework should recognise the links between biodiversity and cultural diversity. The rapid loss of cultural diversity and traditional knowledge poses a significant threat to biodiversity.

F. Voluntary commitments and contributions: What form should voluntary commitments for biodiversity take and how should these relate to or be reflected in the framework?

The voluntary commitments could follow a similar model of nationally determined contributions as has been adopted by the UNFCCC. Updated NBSAPs could provide the vehicle for this and could be extended to include civil society and private sector contributions. Voluntary commitments from “northern” countries should reflect not just domestic action but also action to support biodiversity conservation in the global South.

G. Relationship with other processes: How could the new framework help to ensure coherence, integration and a holistic approach to biodiversity governance and what are the implications for the scope and content of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework?

As discussed under point c. the CBD post 2020 biodiversity framework could provide the overarching governance framework for addressing biodiversity issues that builds on and promote synergies with other relevant processes - both environmental and social. The links between these different agendas should be emphasised and biodiversity governance should be framed as one element of environmental governance – noting the interdependence of agendas on biodiversity, climate change, land degradation – but also as a key component of the human rights agenda. The new framework can also help address gaps in other processes. For example, it could build on the FAO Commission’s global plans of action and work programmes, and address gaps with respect to linkages between wild and on-farm biodiversity and the role of indigenous peoples in sustaining in-situ evolving gene banks for climate change adaptation.

H. Mainstreaming : How can the framework incorporate or support the mainstreaming of biodiversity across society and economies at large?

Achieving many of the existing targets (and probably the new targets) relies on action outside the environment sector to address the drivers of biodiversity loss – hence it is essential that the new framework emphasises the mainstreaming of biodiversity. But the mainstreaming agenda needs to focus clearly on the key sectors that drive biodiversity loss - not broadly on “all sectors of society” – otherwise the imperative risks being diluted. Agriculture, for example, is estimated to be responsible for about 75% of biodiversity loss. Given the rising demand for food driven by population growth and changing consumption patterns, particularly for meat, this will continue unless much stronger action to tackle the underlying causes of biodiversity loss is taken. It is essential to get buy-in from across agriculture, natural resource and economic development sectors. This means engaging different sectoral ministries as early as possible in the process to develop the post-2020 framework, allowing them to shape the biodiversity targets and giving them leadership responsibility and incentives for achieving targets. This is likely to require high level political commitment, ecological and economic studies on the importance of biodiversity to different sectors, and also studies on public opinion, recognising that political will for action to conserve biodiversity (and combat climate change) is now as much shaped by public opinion as it is by scientific research. It may also require participatory planning processes which allow rural communities to identify priorities for biodiversity conservation and natural resource management, integrate these in development plans and push biodiversity up the political agenda.

The rapidly growing global interest in nature-based solutions offers an opportunity for scaling up mainstreaming, presenting biodiversity as a source of human resilience in a warming world, not simply a vulnerability.

1. Relationship with the current Strategic Plan: What are the lessons learned from the implementation of the current Strategic Plan? And how can the transition from the current decade to the post-2020 framework avoid further delays in implementation and where should additional attention be focused?

A key lesson is that many targets will not be achieved. Nevertheless, some significant conservation successes have been achieved since 2011. The new framework should learn from these successes but must also recognise and learn from the failures. Aichi Target 11 is widely considered to be the target where most progress has been made. However this observation relates to the elements of the target focussed on the expansion of area protected. Much less progress has been reported on the effective management element and almost no progress has been reported on equitable management element – more attention is needed here building on recent progress at COP14. The GBO 4 assessment of implementation of the Strategic Plan showed that limited progress had been achieved on Aichi Target 18, on respecting the knowledge, innovations and practices of indigenous and local communities and customary use, and that traditional knowledge is in continuous decline. Although traditional knowledge, innovations and practices are respected and recognised in some countries, they are not fully integrated and reflected in implementation of the Convention. Current trends suggest that the actions taken to date are insufficient to achieve the target by 2020.

Another lesson is that some of the Aichi Targets are unrealistic which undermines their overall credibility in the eyes of governments and other actors. Target 7 for example requires that by 2020 areas under agriculture, aquaculture and forestry are managed sustainably, ensuring conservation of biodiversity. Yet evidence suggests a worsening not improving situation. Aspirational targets that are not realistic can be counterproductive.

Fundamentally, the current framework has no mention of trade-offs between biodiversity conservation and other development goals that need to be carefully weighed. This needs to be addressed in the new framework

J. Indicators: What additional indicators are needed to monitor progress in the implementation of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework at the national, regional and global scales?

Specific indicators will depend on the targets – and some gaps in the targets have already been identified. But in general terms, indicators should focus as much on issues of governance, rights and equity as they do on progress against conservation goals, in line with an overall focus on nature *and* people. Indicators are also needed for monitoring progress at sub-national and local level, including bottom up ‘biocultural indicators’ that indigenous peoples and local communities can develop and use, so that countries can take their contributions into account when reporting on progress towards achieving the targets. These should be developed for targets such as traditional knowledge, customary sustainable use and other effective area-based conservation measures (eg. indigenous and community conserved areas).

K. Implementation and NBSAPs: How can the effectiveness of NBSAPs be strengthened? What additional mechanisms or tools will be required to support implementation of the new framework and how should these be reflected in the framework?

The effectiveness of NBSAPs can be strengthened by ensuring that these are processes of stakeholder engagement across different sectors, rather than just documents, and that these processes are well resourced and have high level political support. As noted under the question on voluntary commitments, they can also be strengthened by reflecting actions from private sector and civil society as well as by government

L. Resource mobilization: How should the post-2020 global biodiversity framework address resource mobilization and what implications does this have for the scope and content of the framework?

NOT ADDRESSED

M. Financial mechanisms : How can the GEF support the timely provision of financial resources to assist eligible Parties in implementing the post-2020 global biodiversity framework?

The GEF should respond to the priorities articulated in NBSAPs – not to priorities put forward by the international agencies that are GEF implementers. GEF could be used as the basis of a PES – type scheme whereby if countries in the global north wish to see their priorities reflected in conservation action in the South then they should be prepared to pay for such action. In the same way GEF should also be used to compensate Southern countries *and communities* for the cost of conservation – for example the cost to local communities of human wildlife conflict, the cost to countries of additional investment to combat illegal wildlife trade.

GEF could also increase the level of funding for small grants to indigenous peoples and local communities, since their activities make an important contribution to conserving biodiversity – and make this funding easier for communities to access. It could also consider channelling funds directly to communities through decentralised financing mechanisms, like those established for climate finance (eg. in Kenya).

N. *Review process: What additional mechanisms, if any, are required to support the review of implementation of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework and how should these be integrated into the framework?*

Countries should work with indigenous and local communities to implement the framework and engage them in reviewing progress to ensure their contribution is reflected in national reports. More attention should be provided to reviewing progress in terms of addressing indirect drivers of biodiversity loss, notably food demand (fuelled as much by consumption patterns as population) and poor environmental governance.

O. *Relationship between the Convention and the Protocols:*

- a. *What are the issues associated with biosafety under the Convention and what are the implications for the post-2020 global biodiversity framework?*
- b. *Access and benefit-sharing is one of the three objectives of the Convention. What are the issues associated with access and benefit-sharing under the Convention and what are the implications for the post-2020 global biodiversity framework?*

Access and benefit-sharing has not provided the revenues for developing countries or communities that were originally hoped. National implementation is complex and costly. Many genetic resources have already been collected and the need to access the physical resource is declining. The Convention might want to expand this work to focus on capacity building at community level for 'full benefit-capture' from value addition and sale of products derived from biodiversity and traditional knowledge. It could also focus on capacity building for the development of community biocultural protocols that serve the dual purpose of access and benefit-sharing and customary sustainable use by communities.

P. *Indigenous people: How can the post-2020 global biodiversity framework facilitate the involvement of indigenous peoples and local communities and support the integration of traditional knowledge as a cross-cutting issue?*

Indigenous peoples should be actively involved in developing the post 2020 biodiversity framework at global level and in every stage of its implementation at national and local level, in order to support the integration of traditional knowledge as a cross-cutting issue. The framework should ensure that the rights of indigenous peoples are also integrated as a cross-cutting issue, in accordance with the UN Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples and the UN Declaration on Rights of the Peasant. The chapeau should state that recognising the existence of indigenous peoples and their rights to land and natural resources is a fundamental pre-requisite for achieving the framework. See also other suggestions above.

Q. *Women and gender: How should gender issues be reflected in the scope and content of the post2020 global biodiversity framework?*

National biodiversity policy and programming rarely acknowledges women's specific roles, capacities and priorities related to biodiversity conservation, and their vulnerabilities to biodiversity loss. While women and gender has gained increasing international attention, most recently with GEF's new gender policy, there is a long way to go to address gender gaps between women and men in national contexts worldwide. One way of addressing women and gender is by integrating gender considerations in NBSAPs to ensure gender issues are addressed in the implementation of the post 2020 framework. More ambitiously, the post 2020 framework should learn from the SDGs, and include a gender-specific target (eg SDG 5) as well as gender specific indicators across all of the post 2020 framework's targets.

R. How should issues related to other groups be reflected in the scope and content of the framework including:

- c. Subnational governments, cities and other local authorities*
- d. Civil society*
- e. Youth*
- f. Private sector*

IPs and women have received a lot of attention in the last 10 years because of NGO support that has helped these groups mobilise and effectively engage. Other groups being just as much affected by conservation choices have much less influence notably youth, non-indigenous communities and other ultra-poor and marginalised groups who are very dependent vulnerable to degradation of ecosystem services that are highly biodiversity dependent.

S. Diverse perspectives: How should the post-2020 global biodiversity framework reflect diverse and multiple perspectives?

NOT ADDRESSED BEYOND ISSUES ALREADY RAISED UNDER OTHER QUESTIONS

T. Communication and outreach: How should the post-2020 global biodiversity framework address issues related to communication and awareness and how can the next two years be used to enhance and support the communication strategy adopted at CoP13 to ensure an appropriate level of awareness? _

NOT ADDRESSED