

In response to Notification SCBD/OES/CPW/JMF/88326 dated 6th September 2019 inviting proposals on the post-2020 Global Biodiversity Framework, TRAFFIC would like respectfully to submit the proposals below for targets on wildlife¹ trade and use to be included in the structure of the framework. These are primarily the result of discussions that were held at the Consultative Workshop on Sustainable Wildlife Management Beyond 2020 organised by the Collaborative Partnership for Sustainable Wildlife Management (CPW) held in Cambridge, United Kingdom, from 25th-26th June 2019. The workshop proceedings are available at [CBD/WG2020/1/INF/3](https://www.cbd.int/inf/3).

Wildlife trade and use 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, plants and fungi contributes to the livelihoods, shelter, food, health and well-being 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, North America and Europe. 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 many other plant species, marine fish and other aquatic species also illegally targeted to supply markets including in Asia, North America, 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 at its 69th Session adopted its first-ever Resolution on Tackling Illicit Trafficking in Wildlife (69/314) – commitment that continues to date under the UNGA's 74th Session: 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 recognized by the UN as 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 **all current seven Thematic Programmes of Work and almost all Cross-Cutting Issues** under the Convention².

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 international trade on biodiversity is generally not well covered**. 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**

¹ In this document, "wildlife" relates to all wild populations of animals, plants and fungi.

² For the seven current Thematic Programmes of Work and Cross-Cutting Issues under the Convention, see <https://www.cbd.int/programmes>.

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 health and well-being (SDG 3), 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 at the Consultative Workshop on Sustainable Wildlife Management Beyond 2020 on the need for an expression of targets concerning wildlife use and trade, two 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 flora³ 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 flora⁴ 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 at the workshop 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, as well as measurable goals and indicators, may be required. For example, 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”. It was also

³ The issue of whether “fungi” should be included in the language of the potential targets was noted during the review of the proceedings but was not raised during the workshop discussion.

⁴ *Ibid*

observed by workshop participants that coordination is needed with the organisations and stakeholders leading on the measurement of progress of existing targets to integrate the information.

Workshop participants discussed the data sets available to underpin the targets discussed (see overleaf – these are included as Annex 3 of the Workshop Proceedings). 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.

*For further information, please contact
Sabri Zain, Director of Policy. Email: Sabri.Zain@traffic.org*

13th September 2019

Datasets to assist the development of indicator on SWM target(s)

| CATEGORY | Type | Datasets | Description (Qty, value, etc.) | Scale | Indicator potential? | Limitations | |
|----------|------------------------|--|--|------------------------|----------------------|--|--|
| Trade | Wildlife trade (legal) | CITES Trade Database | Quantity, volume CITES-listed species,1975-2018 | International | | Reporting quality Mixed units CITES only | |
| | | LEMIS | | | | | |
| | | Fish Catch data - FAO FISHSTAT / RFMOs | | | | | |
| | | Sea Around Us | | | | | |
| | | Globe Fish | | | | | |
| | | FAO Timber | | | | | |
| | | ITTO timber | | | | | |
| | | Overseas trade stats / Customs | | | | | |
| | Domestic Trade | National level Statistics | | | | | |
| | | US / Canada - wild harvest initiative | Harvest / catch data for all hunted/fished species. Species and biomass. States / federal data from licencing, etc. | North America | | | |
| | | Database of collated wild meat studies | Tropical wildmeat - consumption, market, trade | Collated local studies | | | |
| | Illegal Trade | CITES Illegal Trade Report | | International | | New – data from 2016, data only accessible to ICCWC. Access veto - countries can opt out. | |

| CATEGORY | Type | Datasets | Description (Qty, value, etc.) | Scale | Indicator potential? | Limitations |
|-------------------------|--------------------------------------|---|---|----------|----------------------|---------------------------|
| | | World Bank report - costs of illegal timber / fisheries to economies (report in press). | | | | |
| | | Seizure data - TRAFFIC portal | Seizure level information | global | | |
| | | Regional seizures - EU-TWIX / AFRICA-TWIX | | regional | | |
| | | Species-specific databases - ETIS, Rhino, Great Apes | | | | |
| Human-Wildlife conflict | Human-Wildlife conflict | -GAP - no systematic monitoring/data collection | | | | |
| | | Environmental Justice Atlas (ejatlast.com) | All environmental justice conflict | | | |
| | | Compensation schemes | | | | |
| Use | Use – consumptive (Hunting pressure) | Defaunation map Benitez-Lopez 2017. | Abundance data in hunted and unhunted areas - available online | | | |
| | Use – consumptive | IUCN People & Nature | | | | May not exist. |
| | Use – consumptive | Red List Index for Use / Non-Use | | | | Change between categories |
| | Use – consumptive | LPI – used / non-used | | | | Trends in Populations |
| | Use – non-consumptive | -Tourism - global models? (Data gap?) Andrew Balmford Costing nature...? | Mapping the global value and distribution of coral reef tourism Other tourism? | | | |
| | | Visits to national parks...? World Heritage... | | | | |

| CATEGORY | Type | Datasets | Description (Qty, value, etc.) | Scale | Indicator potential? | Limitations |
|--|---|--|--|-------|--|--|
| | Use | Certification schemes - MSC, FSC, FairWild | Example: Proportion of wild fish by volume under MSC certification | | | Confidential, not really aggregated. [ICIL - sustainability standards. Increasing aspects to impact data.] |
| | Sustainable Use | IPBES Sustainable Use Assessment? | | | | |
| | Measure of sustainability | Underlying issue - gap biological data | | | | |
| SPECIES STATUS Populations | Conservation status | IUCN Red List | | | Red List Index of extinction risk over time (RLI) | |
| | Threats | IUCN Red List | | | Threat mapping | |
| | Conservation status | National Red Lists / Regional RL (nationalredlist.org) | | | | |
| | Species population trends | Living Planet Database | | | Living Planet Index (LPI) of species population trends | |
| | | Biodiversity Intactness Index (BII), | Derived from a model of how the species assemblages responds to land use change and other factors. | | | largely terrestrially focused and some of the indicators do not exist for the marine environment (BII). |
| Areas | Protected areas coverage | -WDPA / Protected Planet | | | | |
| | World Heritage sites, Ramsar Sites, KBAs/IBAs, etc. | | | | | |

| CATEGORY | Type | Datasets | Description (Qty, value, etc.) | Scale | Indicator potential? | Limitations |
|------------|----------------------|--|--|-------|----------------------|-------------|
| | Habitat availability | | | | | |
| | Habitat connectivity | | | | | |
| Management | | Gap – laws / level of implementation around regulating hunting/harvest laws | | | | |
| | | Management effectiveness | | | | |
| | | Regulation of “biodiversity” positive / negative goods | | | | |
| | | CITES Appendices, CITES National Legislation Project, etc. | Quality of legislation | | | |
| Other | | Wildlife Insights (camera trapping), Citizen Science, etc. | | | | |
| | | Subsidies / perverse subsidies | Removal of perverse incentives Creating incentives for activities that help us towards the vision. (Paying for public goods, etc.) | | | |