



World Animal Net Proposal on the Post-2020 Global Biodiversity Framework

Contents

General

Policy Structures and Systems

Vision

Mission

Targets/Indicators

Baselines

Implementation

Mainstreaming

Funding

Development and Capacity Building

Technical and Scientific Cooperation and Technology Transfer

Public Awareness

Stakeholder Engagement

Private Sector

Annex 1

General

The post-2020 global biodiversity framework should be an effective and action-oriented strategic plan aimed at preventing further biodiversity loss and recreating biodiversity in areas where it has been degraded. This should be at the core of its main message and be considered a high priority by governments and other stakeholders.

It is vital that biodiversity loss be acknowledged as one of the two major crises facing our planet and humanity today – alongside climate change. The post-2020 global biodiversity framework needs to be ambitious and far-reaching, in order to be commensurate with the challenges of fostering the transformational change required to address catastrophic biodiversity loss.

The [Global Assessment Report on Biodiversity and Ecosystem Services](#), published recently by the Intergovernmental Science-Policy Platform on Biodiversity and Ecosystem Services (IPBES), estimated that a million species are at risk of extinction. IPBES, which identified economic exploitation among the key drivers of biodiversity loss, emphasised that 'transformative changes' are required to restore and protect nature, and indicated a need to overcome opposition from vested interests. The IPBES report strongly emphasizes the need to address the root causes and drivers of biodiversity loss, and we expect to see these reflected in strong targets and indicators.

It is clear that the main barriers to implementation are lack of political will as well as lack of capacity and resources. These barriers need to be addressed to achieve transformative change. For this reason, we suggest a strong focus on the government policies, structures and systems that are needed for effective implementation. To make these actionable, baselines are needed, complemented with regular progress reports - which should be designed in a standard format to provide powerful measurements of progress and comparisons. This will drive political commitment and progress, and serve as a basis for targeted technical and resource assistance, including through development cooperation.

At COP14, Parties agreed that the post-2020 process should be participatory, inclusive, comprehensive, gender-responsive and transformative (among other principles). In order to be truly transformative, the post-2020 framework must address the drivers of biodiversity loss and the financial, investment and legal systems that enable them. This includes reforming perverse incentives and so-called regulatory frameworks that legalise biodiversity destruction for financial gain. These systems have to be upgraded for the 21st century and beyond. They are woefully inadequate to deal with the current environmental and social justice crises we are facing.

Policy Structures and Systems

In order to ensure countries progress towards implementation, the targets and indicators need to include the development of policy structures, systems and capacity. It would be helpful to separate the following three different elements, in order to be able to distinguish between the levels of progress in reporting and monitoring:

- Development of **governance policies, structures and systems** (building effective governance).
- **Basic conditions** – planetary boundaries, as well as biodiversity and habitat loss and restoration.
- Establishment of conditions for **well-being/flourishing**.

Each of these levels needs to be established and measured according to a baseline, targets, and progress. The idea is to map the move from a safety net approach to one that allows for flourishing.

➤ ***Governance: Policy, Structures and Systems***

These would include:

- Government structures – through dedicated departments and mainstreaming.
- Capacity building.
- Constitutions.
- Policies, legislation and standards – including realignment of priorities and financial support.
- Effective enforcement mechanisms.
- Monitoring and evaluation.
- Science/research and responsiveness to science.
- Education and awareness development.

- Participation and subsidiarity – involve all stakeholders, including those in the lowest level of decision-making (local and responsive), with transparency and openness.
- ***Well-Being/Flourishing (Harmony with Nature)***
 - Shifting and adopting a new ethical approach such as Earth Jurisprudence - which involves prioritizing and protecting the natural world, including animals.
 - Environmental rights.
 - Elaboration of internationally-recognised environmental principles.
 - Economic measures aimed at developing and supporting harmony with nature (benign, non-exploitative options).
 - Development of nature-based values/ethics.
 - Education/awareness (through various mediums, including media, the arts - music, theatre, video etc...)
 - Humane and environmental education, including developing a generation of “solutionaries”.
 - Development of altruism/service: Community groups and community service (such as Umuganda (Rwanda)) working on biodiversity issues.
 - Developing nature awareness and greening among local communities – green spaces, nature walks, trees and parks in cities etc...
 - Social/Cultural events with nature themes.
 - Inclusion in religion, spirituality, meditation/mindfulness etc...

Vision

The principle of Living in Harmony with Nature, which entails adopting holistic and integrated approaches and actions that lead to the long-term protection and integrity of the Earth system, should be core to the post-2020 strategy.

Harmony with Nature is already a known and accepted concept at the UN level and internationally. Also, it fits well with various perspectives already accepted by some member states such as Mother Earth, Pachamama etc.

The current vision of a world “Living in harmony with nature” is one where “By 2050, biodiversity is valued, conserved, restored and wisely used, maintaining ecosystem services, sustaining a healthy planet and delivering benefits essential for all people.” This vision is less than optimal. It would be productive and progressive to move in a more benign way e.g. along the lines of: “A world which is living in harmony with nature where biodiversity is valued, respected and protected. By 2050, biodiversity has been restored, and is conserved and protected. Where used by humans, this should only be where necessary and where such use is humane and sustainable, in order to sustain a healthy planet which ensures the well-being of animals, nature and people into the future.”

Mission

An actionable 2030 mission statement should be inspiring and concise and should convey a clear message about the deep transformation that must be achieved by 2030, in order to generate the necessary political will and public interest.

The mission needs to cover key issues such as the need to tackle the root causes of biodiversity loss, whilst regenerating and protecting biodiversity, in order to halt species extinctions and biodiversity losses, and to rebuild flourishing ecosystems worldwide.

The mission should highlight the diverse values of nature (including its intrinsic value) and reflect the fundamental role of biodiversity in sustaining development, human health and well-being, and in achieving climate resilience. The ultimate aim being one of building a society which lives in Harmony with Nature and protects and respects nature and all its elements.

The need for an “apex goal” should be carefully considered. Biodiversity is complex and multi-faceted, and there is a clear danger that any simplified apex goal could detract from the need to work on the many drivers and root causes of biodiversity loss.

Targets/Indicators

Many countries have stated the need for SMART targets/indicators. However, it should be remembered that these can be qualitative as well as quantitative. Lessons can be learned from well-being indicators, which are much more comprehensive in scope.

To achieve timely and effective implementation, it is important to have different time-limits – i.e. to break down targets into sub-targets, each with different deadlines. Without this, the danger is that some targets will simply be left out until it becomes too late to tackle them.

It is also important to break down umbrella goals into actionable targets. Headline indicators should be supported by contributory indicators and milestones, in order to measure progress incrementally. For example, Aichi target 8 - *By 2020, pollution, including from excess nutrients, has been brought to levels that are not detrimental to ecosystem function and biodiversity* - could be broken down into various component parts/aspects (such as controlling different nutrients (fertilizer use, food residues etc.), pesticide use, animal stocking densities reduced etc... along with the establishment of complementary regulation and implementation, plus soil testing periodically etc.

It was suggested that targets and indicators should be identified and developed in parallel to the development of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework. It is also important that they are selected/developed in order to most effectively meet the vision and mission of the framework, and deliver the transformative change needed. They should be built on the existing Aichi Biodiversity targets, updated and improved as needed to achieve the new vision/mission, and using other relevant and useful targets and indicators. For example, the European Environment

Agency (EEA) [Environmental Indicator Report](#) also includes some relevant indicators. Clearly more will need to be developed to deal with the root causes and drivers, as identified in the IPBES report.

We agree with the Global Forest Coalition submission when it stated:

“The post-2020 biodiversity framework should also include a renewed, more specific target on sustainable consumption and production patterns. One important area that the previous Strategic Plan failed to address was the need for sustainable food systems, and especially the need for a global shift towards more plant-based diets in light of the devastating impacts of large-scale livestock and feedstock production on biodiversity and climate change. For that reason, we recommend the inclusion of a specific target that addresses the shift to more balanced, primarily plant-based diets in countries and societies with high meat and dairy consumption levels.”

Baselines

Targets and indicators will only be effective if there are clear baselines, that can serve to measure and judge relative progress against.

Implementation

We agree that the post-2020 global biodiversity framework should have a focus on implementation, with an effective process for monitoring, and periodic reviews to ensure progressive improvement. There must be a credible accountability mechanism by which governments and other stakeholders can be held to account for their progress and implementation. In addition, there should be strategies in place to help those falling behind in their implementation to help them in scaling up their efforts and providing strategic guidance along the way.

Mainstreaming

The protection of biodiversity must be mainstreamed across all relevant government departments, policies and programmes. There also needs to be an analysis of partnerships and synergies, including all relevant policy streams, especially those dealing with any related aspects of biodiversity and ecosystems (animals and plants). Relatedly, World Animal Net (WAN), along with Born Free and Compassion in World Farming (CIWF), gave a joint statement on the topic of cross-cutting issues and mainstreaming biodiversity issues across policy streams during the first Open-Ended Working Group meeting in Nairobi (Refer to [Annex 1](#)).

Funding

On resource mobilisation, governments need to take the primary responsibility for allocating and raising the budgets needed to support implementation. First and foremost, existing funds need to be re-targeted to ensure they are effectively used. Subsidies that are harmful to biodiversity

must be urgently phased out and removed. It is totally unacceptable that some countries are still funding biodiversity loss. For example, over half a trillion US Dollars are spent on agricultural subsidies globally. This funding should be redirected to support positive change towards sustainable, biodiversity-friendly policies and practices and biodiversity restoration. Taxes could be levied on products and practices that are harmful to biodiversity (such as meat and dairy products, and intensive agriculture identified in the IPBES report), helping with changing consumer behavior and raising crucial funds which could then be earmarked for biodiversity programmes.

Development and Capacity Building

Many countries have failed to implement the CBD Biodiversity Framework due to perceived lack of ability and capacity. This must be addressed if the post-2020 framework is to succeed. The new framework must be strong in this regard and include appropriate, innovative and equally ambitious enabling mechanisms.

Capacity building should be impact-focused – prioritising governmental capacity for implementation. Working directly with government departments and mainstreaming into existing capacity building programmes such as agricultural extension, Technical Vocational Education and Training etc. will increase the chances of success.

Development cooperation funding should be given towards capacity building and technical assistance. Showing results through feedback and reporting would attract greater external funding.

Technical and Scientific Cooperation and Technology Transfer

There is a strong need to develop national and regional research capacities. Research networks with lead centres for certain specialisations must collaborate and share expertise with smaller networks through twinning programmes, for example.

Public Awareness

There should be more attention on public awareness and education. There is a need for a new wider societal narrative around biodiversity. Public awareness of the global crisis facing wildlife must increase, to push policy-makers to prioritise the issue at international and national levels. At present, there is little recognition of the fact that biodiversity loss is a crisis comparable to that of climate change, and that it will affect our world as we know it, from plants to animals and humans, impacting food security.

Increasing awareness, appreciation and understanding of the multiple values of biodiversity (including intrinsic, aesthetic, cultural) is key to changing mindsets. We support the view of the Born Free Foundation that taking due consideration of the welfare of individual animals, for their own sake and as key members of animal families, societies, cultures and wider ecosystems, is

key to wildlife conservation and management. The public often responds better to the plight of individual animals which then incites it to make change. Instilling a sense of compassion in people represents a big step towards achieving greater outcomes for wider biodiversity

Media strategy

Regional, national and international media networks and news agencies should be leveraged in order to raise awareness among the public, policymakers and stakeholders about the biodiversity crisis and its already perceivable impacts on entire ecosystems and the planet.

Stakeholder Engagement

It is vital that the process of developing a post-2020 process is (inter alia) participatory, inclusive, gender responsive, comprehensive and transparent. Inclusive and meaningful stakeholder engagement will ensure active and committed participation.

We were concerned about the lack of an inclusive process leading to the thematic consultations, including the selection of the current topics, and how other important topics will be addressed. Importantly, all topics should also be part of the main negotiations in the Working Group and they should be considered through a more inclusive and accessible consultation process, including online submissions and consultations.

We support the requests for:

1. Additional opportunities for future submissions and open online reviews of discussion documents to the future work programme, and clarification on how these submissions will be treated and taken into account.
2. Information on thematic consultations and the application process to be made available in good time, and ensure balanced representation of perspectives.
3. Parties and stakeholders to be invited to host additional thematic consultations on topics that are required for transformative change, notably on drivers and on governance, rights, equity and justice, and the roles of indigenous peoples and local communities.
4. The thematic consultation process to be broadened as per COP Decision 14/34 to include online submissions, online discussion forums and additional dialogues facilitated by rights-holders and stakeholders, while paying attention to their different needs and capacities to engage in such processes.

The future work programme should explicitly provide for these opportunities for broader participation.

We further request support to enable civil society to play a full role in upcoming thematic consultations and Open-Ended Working Groups.

Private Sector

The approach taken so far to the mainstreaming debate places too much emphasis on private sector priorities and mechanisms. As long as their core businesses depend on exploitation of biodiversity and nature, corporations' interests will always conflict with the best interests of people and the planet. The post-2020 framework is a multilateral instrument that must halt industrial drivers of biodiversity loss. We cannot afford to negotiate with the private sector as well.

It is vital that the CBD does not simply invite business interests in to set their own priorities. Truly mainstreaming biodiversity implies that environment ministries will be treated at least on an equal basis, or even be given more weight than other ministries, including finance and development.

In order to address the current biodiversity crisis, we must change our development model which is based on Gross Domestic Product and unlimited growth. Business cannot be expected to lead on dismantling its own system of profit. Yet this is a key underlying driver of the biodiversity crisis.

Annex 1

Cluster 4 – Cross-cutting approaches and issues.

Thank you Chair. This statement is on behalf of World Animal Net, Compassion in World Farming and Born Free Foundation

We welcome consideration of this cluster, and its inclusion of partnerships and synergies. With regard to partnerships and synergies, we hope that this will also include breaking out of CBD silos to cooperate with other related policy streams. We already heard of the existing work of FAO in this regard. Another example is the World Organisation for Animal Health, which leads work on international animal health and welfare standards, including guiding principles for animal welfare – which have been adopted by its 182 member countries. Clearly animal health and welfare plays an important role in the protection of animal species (as well as individual animals).

There is increasing evidence across a wide range of academic disciplines that animal welfare and conservation are intrinsically linked to human health, prosperity and well-being. We believe that these issues should be given due consideration and acknowledged as a catalyst for both biodiversity protection and sustainable development, and therefore be an integral part of the discussions on the post 2020 global biodiversity framework.

We can and should also draw upon the work of other biodiversity-related conventions including the Convention on the Conservation of Migratory Species of Wild Animals (CMS), which has established a working group dedicated to examining how “animal culture, social complexity [and] social learning” contribute to conservation. CITES also addresses several wildlife welfare and health issues.

All too often our focus on biodiversity leads to a type of “group-think” which focuses on the “big picture” of species, without sufficient recognition of the importance of individual animals and their health and welfare – despite the fact that these are sentient beings. And the fact that the whole is made up of individuals.

This is another silo – a silo of the mind.