**POST-2020 GLOBAL BIODIVERSITY FRAMEWORK: DISCUSSION PAPER**

The following is a response provided to the Executive Secretary of the Convention on Biological Diversity (SCBD) on the Issues and Questions for Discussion included in the document ‘POST-2020 GLOBAL BIODIVERSITY FRAMEWORK: DISCUSSION PAPER’ (CBD/POST2020/PREP/1/1, 25 January 2019) in relation to Preparations for the Post-2020 Biodiversity Framework.

The submission is provided by **TRAFFIC.**

**IV. ISSUES AND QUESTIONS FOR DISCUSSION**

*10. Based on previous decision and submissions from Parties and observers, a number of issue areas are identified below. Some questions to stimulate further discussion are also provided.*

**A. Structure of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework**

*11. Many submissions suggested that a structure or approach is needed to link the different elements of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework and to highlight the linkages between its different elements. In the submissions, several different possible models or approaches were proposed. Some of the suggested approaches have been a pyramid or tiered structure while others have suggested structures similar to the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development and the current Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020.*

**Question: 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?**

**Answer:**

TRAFFIC suggests that an action-orientated framework based on a refined and updated series of global targets (modelled on the existing Aichi Targets) can be the most effective structure for the post-2020 global biodiversity framework. The organization of a series of elements might well be achieved by grouping specific targets under a series of objectives, in a similar way to the use of Strategic Goals in the current Strategic Plan for Biodiversity (SPB).

A notable **element not being currently addressed by the SPB Goals** is the lack of targets focussing on **addressing a particular key driver of biodiversity loss – unsustainable and illegal use and trade of wildlife** (encompassing flora and fauna, marine and terrestrial). 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, and sustainable, well-managed legal wildlife trade having a scope for providing benefits to all from biodiversity and ecosystem services, the Aichi Targets do not include a target specific to trade in wildlife. While 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 relevant areas of work in CBD include notably the Global Strategy for Plant Conservation, Sustainable Use of Biodiversity (including Sustainable Wildlife management), Health and Biodiversity, Business and Biodiversity, among others.

More perspectives on the relevance of wildlife trade to the post-2020 biodiversity framework can be found in the Annexe (p. 7 below).

**B. Ambition of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework**

*12. A general view is that the post-2020 global biodiversity framework should be ambitious and support the transformational changes needed to realize the 2050 Vision for Biodiversity. The post-2020 global biodiversity framework should serve as a universal framework for action on biodiversity and foster strong ownership and support for its implementation.*

**Question: In the context of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework, what would “ambitious” specifically mean?**

**Answer:**

For the post-2020 global biodiversity framework fully to serve as a universal framework for action on biodiversity, it is critical that it comprehensively addresses the issue of wildlife trade. This issue has in recent years gained political attention at the highest levels and TRAFFIC believes that establishing an ambitious target within the Post-2020 Global Biodiversity Framework, which focuses on wildlife trade, will help encourage the political commitment and levels of implementation necessary to address biodiversity conservation as a truly global issue. It will also ensure connectivity with the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs), something we feel is essential when addressing this key topic. To this end, we request the CBD Secretariat to **consider including the following target within the post-2020 framework:**

**Reduce the pressure of illegal and unsustainable trade in wild flora and fauna on biodiversity**, **and** **enhance the benefits to wildlife conservation and human well-being that derive from legal wildlife trade at sustainable levels**

TRAFFIC will be available to work with the CBD Secretariat and other organizations, as necessary, to develop a set of ambitious but practical and measurable indicators for this target. Example sub-targets (with accompanying indicators further available) that could be used to evaluate the success of Parties, other governments and stakeholders in achieving the target include:

* Illegal trade in elephant, 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
* Best practice guidelines (e.g. the FairWild Standard recognised by the CBD’s Global Strategy for Plant Conservation) applied to trade in 50 priority wild plant value chains
* Robust traceability mechanisms established for high risk wild species in trade

It may be useful to note that from the perspective of businesses expressing their commitment to the implementation of global targets, SGD 15.7 has proven difficult to report against. A target articulating a commitment to reduce illegal wildlife trade and/or support legal and sustainable trade, as well as the relevant traceability and legal mechanisms would support a business response and potentially support a review of the SDG 15.7 indicators that businesses could then use to show their contribution to the delivery of the global commitments to ensure legality in wildlife trade.

Regarding the process of the development of the post-2020 framework, TRAFFIC recommends the balanced inclusion of Parties and other relevant stakeholder from across the world, including through inclusive regional and sectoral consultations, to achieve the development of robust and representative targets.

TRAFFIC will also support the formulation of Targets around enabling conditions, including good governance, adequate financing, capacity building to ensure the implementation of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework, and necessary linkages with other global commitments.

**C. 2050 Vision for Biodiversity**

*13. Decision 14/2, sets out that the 2050 Vision “Living in harmony with nature” remains relevant and should be considered in the post-2020 global biodiversity framework. Further many submissions also indicated that the rationale for the 2050 Vision should be further developed and that a common and clear understanding of what reaching the 2050 Vision for Biodiversity entails in concrete terms needs to be developed.*

**Question: 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 global biodiversity framework and what actions are needed between now and 2050 to reach the 2050 Vision?**

**Answer:**

This means effectively addressing the four key elements of the vision (valuing biodiversity, conserving biodiversity, restoring biodiversity and sustainably using biodiversity in a balanced manner. Having clear and measurable deliverables under these key elements coupled with the balanced programme focus and implementation that gives equal treatment to the three pillars of the Convention can lead towards greater harmony of people living with nature.

**E. Biodiversity Targets**

*15. There is wide support for the post-2020 global biodiversity framework having a set of science-and knowledge-based “SMART” (specific, measurable, ambitious, realistic and time-bound) biodiversity targets for the period from 2021 to 2030. Several submissions noted that the Aichi Biodiversity Targets should be used as the basis for developing any new targets and that changes to these should be kept to a minimum. Alternatively, it was suggested that some “modernization” of the Aichi Targets might be required. Further, many submissions suggested possible new targets.*

**Questions:**

 (b) **How should the set of targets in the post-2020 global biodiversity framework relate to existing Aichi Biodiversity Targets?**

**Answer:**

The set of targets in the post-2020 framework should build on the Aichi targets in a meaningful manner. Parties have taken to familiarize themselves with and implement the Aichi targets by developing their National Biodiversity Strategies and Action Plans (NBSAPs), most of which would remain under implementation beyond 2020. A radical shift in targets that is divorced of the Aichi targets can create frustration and push parties back to the drawing board resulting in the loss of momentum in implementation.

 (c) **How should the set of targets in the post-2020 global biodiversity framework align with other global targets, including those adopted under the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development?**

**Answer:**

The alignment between the post-2020 global biodiversity framework and the SDGs would be important for coherent delivery against the targets.

An example of a Sustainable Development Goal (SDG), which is not reflected in the Aichi Targets is one concerning the commitments to addressing the sustainable use of natural resources and tackling one of the main drivers of biodiversity decline – unsustainable and illegal trade in flora and fauna. This is covered in 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*”. Establishing a target within the Post-2020 Global Biodiversity Framework, which focuses on wildlife trade, is essential to ensure the political commitment and levels of implementation to address this truly global issue. It will also ensure connectivity with the SDGs, essential when addressing this key topic.

**F. Voluntary commitments and contributions**

*16. Decision 14/34 invites Parties and other Governments to consider developing biodiversity commitments which contribute to an effective post-2020 global biodiversity framework and encourages indigenous peoples and local communities and all relevant organizations and stakeholders, including the private sector, to contribute to the Sharm El-Sheikh to Beijing Action Agenda for Nature and People. Several submissions also commented on the desirability of voluntary commitments. However, others felt that voluntary commitments, while providing useful impetus, may not directly lead the global community to scientifically supported goals and outcomes.*

**Question: What form should voluntary commitments for biodiversity take and how should these relate to or be reflected in the post-2020 global biodiversity framework?**

**Answer:**

In the context of the post-2020 target focussing on wildlife trade, e.g. *Reduce the pressure of illegal and unsustainable trade in wild flora and fauna on biodiversity, and enhance the benefits to wildlife conservation and human well-being that derive from legal wildlife trade at sustainable levels*, the voluntary commitments of the wide range of stakeholders are important elements to support the implementation of this ambitious work. It may be feasible to have a phase approach, within a time bound framework to move an ambitious voluntary commitment also to be a global obligation in due course.

It may be useful to note that from the perspective of businesses expressing their commitment to the implementation of global targets, SGD 15.7 has proven difficult to report against. A post-2020 target, articulating a commitment to reduce illegal wildlife trade and/or support legal and sustainable trade, as well as the relevant traceability mechanisms would support a business response and potentially support a review of the SDG 15.7 indicators that businesses could then use to show their contribution to the delivery of the global commitments to ensure legality in wildlife trade.

**I. Relationship with the current Strategic Plan**

*19. Many submissions note that the post-2020 global biodiversity framework should build from the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020.*

**Question: 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?**

**Answer:**

The biggest challenge with the current strategic plan is that it that it does not have a clear “theory of change”. So, the logical cascade from goals to targets and the sufficiency of a given set of targets to deliver the goals is unclear.

**K. Indicators**

*20. The importance of identifying indicators for the different elements of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework was noted in many submissions. Most suggested that the starting point for indicators should be the indicators developed for the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020 noted in decision XIII/28. The indicators used in the IPBES global assessment were also suggested. The need for indicators which could be used at the global and regional level was also noted.*

**Question: What indicators, in addition to those already identified in decision XIII/28, are needed to monitor progress in the implementation of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework at the national, regional and global scales?**

**Answer:**

Of specific reference to the potential target focusing on “Reducing the pressure of illegal and unsustainable trade in wild flora and fauna on biodiversity, and enhance the benefits to wildlife conservation and human well-being that derive from legal wildlife trade at sustainable levels”, we can propose a set of indicators for discussion/input.

**O. Review process**

*24. The need for an effective and timely review process for the post-2020 global biodiversity framework was noted in many submissions. In this respect, the continued importance of the national reports and the clearing-house mechanism of the Convention were highlighted. However, the need for more effective, robust and accountable national reporting was also highlighted. In addition, many submissions suggested additional mechanisms for reviewing progress in implementation and for building accountability and transparency.*

**Question: 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?**

**Answer:**

Additional mechanisms should be integrated into the framework. However, it should be noted that countries are already expected to report against their national progress for many of the international agreements already entered into. It would be a significant reduction in reporting burden if more common reporting at the national level can be found, that captures the information and data needs that are common across the agreements, while allowing for additional reporting specific to the biodiversity framework.

**Q. Integrating diverse perspectives**

 *27. Many submissions noted that the development and implementation of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework will require a “whole of society approach”. The need to have greater involvement of some specific groups was repeatedly emphasized in the submissions, including:*

*(a) Indigenous peoples and local communities: the Conference of the Parties to the Convention on Biological Diversity, in decision 14/34, requested the Ad Hoc Open-ended Working Group on Article 8(j) and Related Provisions to provide recommendations concerning the potential role of traditional knowledge, customary sustainable use and the contribution of the collective actions of indigenous peoples and local communities to the post-2020 global biodiversity framework, in support of the work of the open-ended intersessional working group. The continued role of indigenous peoples and local communities and the importance of traditional and local knowledge in the post-2020 global biodiversity framework was also noted in several submissions.*

**Question: 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?**

**Answer:**

The involvement of indigenous peoples and local communities (IPLCs) are mostly side-lined in general, and their traditional knowledge is currently a niche input to the scientific community and some sectors. Their knowledge is not sufficiently integrated into the mainstream thinking and action. More awareness among the scientific community, decision makers of the value of the traditional knowledge could help bridge this gap. Policies and legal frameworks, with strong institutional shift in emphasis of the roles and contribution of IPLCs can help to ensure traditional knowledge can be mainstreamed and acknowledged as important contributions to biodiversity conservation, value and sustainable utilization.

 *(d) Civil society: the need to enhance the participation, at the national, regional and international levels, of civil society in the post-2020 process was noted.*

**Question: How can the post-2020 global biodiversity framework facilitate the involvement of civil society in the development and implementation of the framework?**

The highest decision-making body of the framework should have clear policies stating and welcoming the roles of civil society. This will set the tone for parties and countries to consider working with civil society. The policy should be reflected similarly across all international agreements. This involvement of civil society, at the policy, institutional, implementation and actions taken, should be items captured during national reporting.

 *(f) Private sector: it was suggested in several submissions that there is a need for greater involvement of the private sector in biodiversity issues.*

**Question: How should issues related to the engagement of the private sector be reflected in the scope and content of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework?**

**Answer:**

This questions links back directly to the topic of “Voluntary commitments” and “Mainstreaming”. The Post-2020 framework is likely to be more successful if it creates clear mechanisms for the private sector to engage with its implementation—including by making the voluntary commitments and reporting on their progress.

**Annexe**

**TRAFFIC’s briefing on post-2020 biodiversity framework (submitted to CBD Secretariat in December 2018)**

**Background**

Wildlife trade is 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 jeopardizes 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. It is not only terrestrial animal species that are threatened by illegal activities. A growing number of timber and plant species, marine fish and other aquatic species are 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 organizations 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.

Fortunately, the past decade has also seen the development and implementation of a growing number of regulatory and voluntary systems and approaches to support sustainable management of wildlife resources and facilitate benefit flows from legal, sustainable wildlife trade. Positive actions by businesses that depend on sustainable supplies of wild-sourced products are also growing. Chain of custody, certification and other approaches are increasingly being used to demonstrate sustainability and traceability along supply chains in the timber, fisheries, botanicals, and leather goods sectors. Key companies in sectors such as transport, logistics, courier and freight companies, alongside e-commerce, social media and travel and tourism, are mainstreaming biodiversity into their operations by implementing “zero-tolerance” policies towards illegal wildlife trade. Governments have also acted to strengthen management and traceability systems for wildlife products in trade, e.g. in relation to timber trade in Lao People’s Democratic Republic, Kingdom of Cambodia, Republic of the Union of Myanmar, United Republic of Tanzania, Republic of Cameroon and Republic of Madagascar, and trade in European Eels to Asia.

Nevertheless, expanding human populations, growing consumer purchasing power and global interconnectivity drive and facilitate increasing wildlife consumption that is all too often at unsustainable levels. Illegal exploitation and trade in wildlife products, exacerbated by corruption and links with financing other illicit activities, continues to drive an increasing number of species towards extinction, and undermine national and international efforts to transition towards sustainable practices.

**CBD and wildlife trade**

The Aichi Targets in the CBD’s Strategic Plan to 2020 do not include a target specific related 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, recognize 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, 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**.

In 2015, the United Nations General Assembly adopted the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development and the accompanying Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) and Targets. This has renewed policy attention to 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***”

**Recommendation for the Post-2020 Global Biodiversity Framework**

TRAFFIC believes that establishing a target within the Post-2020 Global Biodiversity Framework, which focuses on wildlife trade, is essential to ensure the political commitment and levels of implementation to address this truly global issue. It will also ensure connectivity with the SDGs, something we feel is essential when addressing this key topic.

To this end, we request the CBD Secretariat to **consider including the following target within the post-2020 framework:**

**Reduce the pressure of illegal and unsustainable trade in wild flora and fauna on biodiversity**, **and** **enhance the benefits to wildlife conservation and human well-being that derive from legal wildlife trade at sustainable levels**

TRAFFIC will be available to work with the CBD Secretariat and other organizations, as necessary, to develop a set of measurable indicators for this target. Example sub-targets (with accompanying indicators further available) that could be used to evaluate the success of Parties, other governments and stakeholders in achieving the target include:

* Illegal trade in elephant, 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
* Best practice guidelines (e.g. the FairWild Standard recognized by the CBD’s Global Strategy for Plant Conservation) applied to trade in 50 priority wild plant value chains
* Robust traceability mechanisms established for high risk wild species in trade

It may be useful to note that from the perspective of businesses expressing their commitment to the implementation of global targets, SGD 15.7 has proven difficult to report against. A target articulating a commitment to reduce illegal wildlife trade and/or support legal and sustainable trade, as well as the relevant traceability mechanisms would support a business response and potentially support a review of the SDG 15.7 indicators that businesses could then use to show their contribution to the delivery of the global commitments to ensure legality in wildlife trade.

Regarding the process of the development of the post-2020 framework, TRAFFIC recommends the balanced inclusion of Parties and other relevant stakeholder from across the world, including through inclusive regional consultations, to achieve the development of robust and representative targets.

TRAFFIC will also support the formulation of Targets around enabling conditions, including good governance, adequate financing, capacity building to ensure the implementation of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework, and necessary linkages with other global commitments.