



## Convention on Biological Diversity

Distr.  
GENERAL

CBD/POST2020/WS/2020/4/4  
15 January 2021

ENGLISH ONLY

### REPORT OF THE THEMATIC CONSULTATION ON SUSTAINABLE USE OF BIOLOGICAL DIVERSITY FOR THE POST-2020 GLOBAL BIODIVERSITY FRAMEWORK

VIRTUAL CONSULTATION, 27 JULY - 8 OCTOBER 2020

#### CONTENTS

Introduction .....	3
Section 1. Opening webinar .....	4
Section 2. Online survey .....	7
Section 3. Online discussion forum .....	7
Section 4. Closing webinar .....	8
Annex I. Opening webinar presentation summaries .....	10
Annex II. Synthesis of discussions and submissions made by participants throughout the Virtual Consultation on the Sustainable Use of Biological Diversity for the Post-2020 Global Biodiversity Framework.....	20
Sustainable use of biological diversity across the post-2020 global biodiversity framework .....	20
Sustainable harvest, trade and use of biodiversity (target 4).....	24
Ensuring benefits to people through the sustainable use of biodiversity (target 8) .....	30
Sustainable use of biodiversity in managed ecosystems (target 9) .....	35
Mainstreaming and sustainable use across sectors (target 13).....	38
Sustainable consumption and production (target 15).....	42
Customary sustainable use.....	45
Terminology where clarification is needed .....	51
Sustainable use of biodiversity in other targets of the framework .....	51
General comments on the post-2020 global biodiversity framework with focus beyond the sustainable use of biodiversity.....	54
Annex III. Suggested additions and changes to the draft monitoring framework.....	55
Annex IV. Online survey questions.....	89
Annex V. Online discussion forum questions .....	91
Annex VI. List of parties and organizations represented during the consultation .....	92

## SUSTAINABLE USE OF BIOLOGICAL DIVERSITY

Sustainable use of biological diversity is one of the three objectives of the Convention on Biological Diversity, and decision [V/24](#) frames sustainable use as a cross-cutting issue. Sustainable use is also defined as an effective tool to combat poverty, to achieve sustainable development also through supporting implementation of 2030 Sustainable Development Agenda and its goals, and is reflected in the 2050 Vision: “By 2050, biodiversity is valued, conserved, restored and wisely used, maintaining ecosystem services, sustaining a healthy planet and delivering benefits essential for all people.”

The sustainable use of biological diversity is not only essential to the full functioning of ecosystems and survival of species but also benefits humankind, particularly those people who are dependent on biological resources for their livelihoods, notably indigenous peoples and local communities, women, youth and the poor and vulnerable. However, one of the challenges for the global biodiversity agenda is simultaneously improving human livelihoods while minimizing human negative impacts on the natural resource base.

The Addis Ababa Principles and Guidelines for the Sustainable Use of Biodiversity provide a framework for assisting Governments, indigenous peoples and local communities, resource managers, the private sector and other stakeholders, in ensuring that their uses of biological diversity will not lead to its long-term decline. The principles highlight how ecosystems contribute to and maintain cultures, societies and communities. The Addis Ababa Principles and Guidelines were adopted at the seventh meeting of the Conference of the Parties to the Convention.<sup>1</sup>

The Convention has taken an integrated approach to addressing the sustainable use of biodiversity through the work on mainstreaming which is generally understood as ensuring that biodiversity, and the services it provides, are appropriately and adequately factored into policies and practices that rely and have an impact on biodiversity. In 2016, the Conference of the Parties adopted the Cancun Declaration<sup>2</sup> on mainstreaming the conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity for well-being as well as subsequent decisions of the Conference of the Parties (including [14/6](#) and [14/7](#)), in which Parties committed to work at all levels within governments and across all sectors to mainstream biodiversity. In 2018, Parties decided<sup>3</sup> to establish an Informal Advisory Group on Mainstreaming of Biodiversity to advise the Executive Secretary and the Bureau of the Conference of the Parties on further development of the proposal for a long-term approach to mainstreaming biodiversity also as a contribution to the post-2020 global biodiversity framework.

Furthermore, the Convention recognizes that the involvement and participation of indigenous peoples, in countries with indigenous peoples, and local communities and relevant stakeholders, including in natural resource management can be critical for their conservation and sustainable use. The programme of work on Article 8(j) and related provisions<sup>4</sup> is the main instrument that Parties to the Convention have given themselves to achieve, by 2020, the commitments in Article 8(j) and related provisions and later, Aichi Biodiversity Target 18.<sup>5</sup> Regarding Article 10(c), the chief means of implementation, building on the Addis Ababa Guidelines for Sustainable Use, is the Global Plan of Action on the Customary Sustainable Use of Biological Diversity.

---

<sup>1</sup> <https://www.cbd.int/doc/publications/addis-gdl-en.pdf>

<sup>2</sup> <https://www.cbd.int/cop/cop-13/hls/cancun%20declaration-en.pdf>

<sup>3</sup> [Decision 14/3](#) Mainstreaming of biodiversity in the energy and mining, infrastructure, manufacturing and processing sectors

<sup>4</sup> The Conference of the Parties adopted the programme of work on Article 8(j) and related provisions in [decision VII/16](#).

<sup>5</sup> See Target 18 at: <https://www.cbd.int/sp/targets/#GoalD>

## INTRODUCTION

1. In decision [14/34](#) (para. 6), the Conference of the Parties urged Parties and invited other Governments and stakeholders to “actively engage and contribute to the process of developing a robust post-2020 global biodiversity framework in order to foster strong ownership of the framework to be agreed and strong support for its immediate implementation”. Therefore, it was agreed that regional consultations and thematic workshops would serve as a platform for the discussions. At its first meeting, the Open-ended Working Group on the Post-2020 Global Biodiversity Framework took note of a preliminary list of meetings, consultations and workshops for the development of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework and requested that this be further developed and updated.<sup>6</sup>

2. The Thematic Consultation on Sustainable Use of Biological Diversity for the Post-2020 Global Biodiversity Framework was originally scheduled to be held in Bern from 30 March to 1 April 2020.<sup>7</sup> In light of the coronavirus COVID-19 pandemic, a virtual consultation was organized as an alternative to a face-to-face meeting, to ensure that further views on elements related to the sustainable use of biodiversity for the post-2020 global biodiversity framework were elicited in-depth. Thus, the Thematic Consultation on the Sustainable Use of Biological Diversity for the Post-2020 Global Biodiversity Framework was held virtually, from 27 July to 8 October 2020. The virtual consultation included an online survey, a series of webinars and an online discussion forum. The first webinar included expert presentations and provided further details on the process of the consultation and open the period for completing the survey. The online forum discussed the preliminary results of the survey. The second webinar presented the preliminary outcomes of all discussions and identified some key priorities based on the preliminary outcomes presented.

3. The consultation was organized by two co-leads, Ms. Martha Mphatso Kalemba (Malawi) and Mr. Norbert Barlocher (Switzerland) who were appointed by the Co-Chairs of the Open-ended Working Group on the Post-2020 Global Biodiversity Framework, with the support of the Secretariat of the Convention on Biological Diversity and with the generous financial support of Norway. The consultation was organized under the guidance of the Co-Chairs of the Working Group. The consultation was attended by a total of 329 participants who participated in at least one of the four activities of the consultation. These include representatives of Parties to the Convention, other governments, United Nations agencies, intergovernmental and non-governmental organizations (NGOs), as well as relevant organizations and representatives of indigenous peoples and local communities and other stakeholder groups (women and youth). A complete list of Parties and organizations represented during the consultation is provided in annex VI.

4. The thematic consultation aimed at providing specific inputs for the use of the Co-Chairs of the Working Group on the Post-2020 Global Biodiversity Framework for consideration in their work to prepare draft one of the post-2020 framework. The outputs will contribute to informing discussions at the twenty-fourth meeting of the Subsidiary Body on Scientific, Technical and Technological Advice and the third meeting of the Open-ended Working Group. As planned, the thematic workshop explored options for elements of goal(s), target(s), component(s) and monitoring element(s) with baselines and relevant indicators on sustainable use to inform the development of post-2020 global biodiversity framework.

5. The dates for the virtual consultation and for registering were informed through notification [2020-051](#). A concept note was posted on the consultation website, and an introductory information email was sent to participants. Three information documents were also issued: (a) a [summary of comments](#) from notification 2019-08, from outcomes of the second meeting of the Open-ended Working Group and from discussions held at thematic workshops previously convened by the Secretariat, relating to targets of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework that relate to the sustainable use of biological diversity; (b) a

---

<sup>6</sup> For the report of the Open-ended Working Group on the Post-2020 Global Biodiversity Framework on its first meeting, see [CBD/WG2020/1/5](#).

<sup>7</sup> The meeting had generous financial support from the Government of Norway and was planned to be hosted by the Government of Switzerland. The concept note can be found at the following link: <https://bit.ly/3dBnIO0>.

[summary of suggestions and comments](#) from notification 2019-08 relating to indicators of the monitoring framework for the post-2020 global biodiversity framework related to the sustainable use of biological diversity; and (c) a [summary of key activities and decisions](#) relating to customary sustainable use under the Convention.

6. This document is organized in four sections. Section 1 outlines the presentations and discussions held during the opening webinar; section 2 outlines the procedure and participation level of the online survey; section 3 outlines the procedure and participation level of the online discussion forum; and section 4 outlines the presentations and discussions held during the closing webinars. Annex I includes a detailed summary of the presentations, questions and discussions held during the opening webinar. Annex II includes a synthesis of the discussions and submissions made by participants throughout the virtual consultation on the sustainable use of biodiversity, organized thematically. These summaries should not be interpreted in any way as a consensus nor as recommendation but a compilation of views from participants and discussion throughout the consultation, as potential input for further discussions in the development of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework.

7. Annex III includes suggestions to the draft monitoring framework for the post-2020 global biodiversity framework made available for peer review for the twenty-fourth meeting of the Subsidiary Body on Scientific, Technical and Technological Advice suggested in the online survey and in the online discussion forum. This compilation can contribute to informing discussions at the twenty-fourth meeting of the Subsidiary Body on Scientific, Technical and Technological Advice and the third meeting of the Open-ended Working Group. Annex IV and V include the questions provided in the online survey and discussion forum, respectively. Annex VI contains a list of Parties and organizations that registered for the consultation.

## **SECTION 1. OPENING WEBINAR**

8. The first activity of the virtual consultation was an opening webinar, which was held on 27 July 2020. The webinar consisted of nine presentations made by the co-leads of the consultation, experts on sustainable use, and the Co-Chairs of the Open-ended Working Group. There were also three question and answer sessions held intermittently throughout the webinar and a discussion session held after the presentations.

9. Participants were welcomed by Ms. Elizabeth Maruma Mrema, Executive Secretary of the Secretariat of the Convention on Biological Diversity. In her opening statement, Ms. Mrema highlighted to participants that this was the first thematic consultation for the post-2020 global biodiversity framework to be held virtually. She reminded participants that the sustainable use of biodiversity was one of the three objectives of the Convention and was essential for protecting both human and ecosystem health. She mentioned that sustainable use ensured the conservation of biodiversity while also benefitting humans, especially the most vulnerable who depended directly on biodiversity for their livelihoods. Sustainable use was a cross-cutting issue and an important tool to achieve sustainable development and the Convention's 2050 Vision. Finally, she encouraged participants to be ambitious and aim for a transformative framework, ensuring that the sustainable use of biodiversity was enshrined as a tenant of the post-2020 framework.

10. Ms. Martha Mphatso Kalemba (Malawi) and Mr. Norbert Barlocher (Switzerland), the co-leads for the consultation appointed by the Co-Chairs of the Working Group, introduced the meeting by covering its purpose and expected outputs. Potential outputs included views on how the sustainable use of biodiversity can be strengthened in the framework and concrete proposals for the goals, targets, indicators and baselines within the draft post-2020 global biodiversity framework. They explained that the outputs of this consultation would be shared at the twenty-fourth meeting of the Subsidiary Body on Scientific, Technical and Technological Advice and the third meeting of the Open-ended Working Group. They outlined the scope, process and partners of the virtual consultation. They also reiterated that sustainable use would be considered a cross-cutting objective for the framework.

11. A presentation was made by Ms. Dilys Roe, Chair of the IUCN Sustainable Use and Livelihoods Specialist Group, International Union for Conservation of Nature, on the concept of sustainable use. Ms. Roe reminded attendees that sustainable use was one of the three foundational pillars of the Convention. She provided the definition of sustainable use, as defined under the Convention, and listed the agreements by Parties regarding sustainable use under Article 10 of the Convention text. Mrs. Roe then provided an overview of the CBD Addis Ababa Principles and Guidelines for the Sustainable use of Biodiversity, as well as definitions of sustainable use in other biodiversity conventions. She also explained that different perceptions of sustainable use existed, where people saw sustainable use either as a desirable end state, or as a tool for biodiversity conservation and human benefit. She then went over the different perceptions, drivers, practices and purposes of sustainable use. Her presentation concluded by reviewing how sustainable use was currently reflected in a few targets of the draft post-2020 global biodiversity framework.

12. Ms. Marla Emery and Mr. John Donaldson, Co-Chairs of the Thematic Assessment of the Sustainable Use of Wild Species of the Intergovernmental Science-Policy Platform on Biodiversity and Ecosystem Services (IPBES), presented an overview of the process of the IPBES Assessment on Sustainable Use. Ms. Emery first gave an overview of the contents and timeline for the assessment. Mr. Donaldson and Ms. Emery went on to explain the approach, framework and definitions used for the assessment. Mr. Donaldson noted that the document aimed to understand the drivers of sustainable use and explored plausible futures and target seeking scenarios to identify leverage points and pathways to drive transformative change. Mrs. Emery highlighted that policies on sustainable use had to balance social and ecological dimensions and recognize that responses operate at different scales. Mr. Donaldson concluded by stating that a challenge for the post-2020 global biodiversity framework would be to identify what was required to transition towards a just and sustainable use of wild species.

13. Mr. Kim Friedman, Senior Fishery Resources Officer for the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations, gave a presentation on sustainable use in agriculture, fisheries and forestry following the question-and-answer period. Mr. Friedman gave an overview of how perceptions of nature and conservation had changed through time. He explained the need to shift focus to include areas where human-nature interactions occurred, to engage and empower the communities that rely on biodiversity for their food and livelihoods to become part of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework. Mr. Friedman noted that the post-2020 framework needed to recognize the interconnectedness of social and ecological systems to bring about transformative change. He then explained why sustainable use was important for the delivery of outcomes in the post-2020 framework. He concluded the presentation with four key recommendations to strengthen sustainable use in the draft framework.

14. Ms. Kristina Rodina, Secretary from the Collaborative Partnership on Sustainable Wildlife Management (CPW) gave a presentation on sustainable wildlife management. Ms. Rodina started by giving an overview of the activities of the CPW, which was comprised of 14 partners, over the past year. Ms. Rodina then went over the recommendations and suggested indicators provided by the CPW for strengthening Targets 3, 4, 8, 13, 14 and 15 of the zero draft of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework. She also reviewed guiding principles recently developed by the CPW to prevent the spread of zoonotic diseases. Ms. Rodina concluded the presentation by highlighting that the post-2020 framework represented an important opportunity to address issues related to biodiversity and human health through multi-sectoral collaboration.

15. Ms. Joji Carino, Senior Policy Advisor for the Forest Peoples Programme, then gave a presentation on customary sustainable use following the question-and-answer session. Ms. Carino began by explaining how customary sustainable use was relevant to all three objectives of the Convention. She noted that customary sustainable use had so far been underrecognized, undervalued and underreported, and this was a missed opportunity. She highlighted how for indigenous peoples and local communities and all of humanity, the continuation of customary sustainable use would strongly determine whether we achieved our 2050 vision of living in harmony with nature and the 2030 milestone targets. She provided recommendations on how the post-2020 global biodiversity framework can better promote the interlinkages

between biological and cultural diversity and accommodate diverse ways of knowing and doing. Some specific examples of how customary sustainable use could be better integrated across the framework were then given. Ms. Carino concluded by noting that once the global framework was approved, an opportunity where indigenous peoples and local communities, scientists and other stakeholders can come together in a technical process to operationalize customary sustainable use indicators in the framework would be needed.

16. Ms. Maxi Louis, Director of the Namibian Association of Community based Natural Resources Management Support Organizations (NACSO), gave a presentation on community-based resource management. Ms. Louis began by explaining some of the benefits of community based natural resource management. Ms. Louis then explained what community based natural resource management entailed in the South African context. She explained that it allowed communities to have control over land uses that will be able to address their needs, allowing them to use natural resources as a driver for economic growth. She emphasized that there needed to be an enabling environment for communities to participate, thus legal frameworks were important. She explained that communities wanted to be equal partners in every investment in their natural resources; they wanted to be shareholders and not just users. She went on to highlight why sustainable use was important and listed barriers to sustainable use that needed to be addressed. Ms. Louis concluded by saying that community conservation was at the heart of the Southern African economy and future development plans and highlighted the need to empower and give rights to communities to ensure they protect the environment.

17. Ms. Valerie Normand, Senior Expert on Access and Benefit-sharing for the Union for Ethical Biotrade (UEBT), gave a presentation on sustainable use in the private sector. Ms. Normand began by giving an overview of the work of the UEBT. She explained that they supported and verified the commitments of companies in the food, cosmetic, natural pharmaceutical, personal care, flavours, and fragrances sectors to sourcing with respect to people and biodiversity. The UEBT Ethical Biotrade Standard was at the core of UEBT's work and was based on seven principles, three of which were directly related to the CBD objectives, including sustainable use. Ms. Normand stated that, as a contribution to the post-2020 global biodiversity framework, UEBT had created a report detailing lessons learned over their past 10 years of work. She went over the 10 lessons from the report, each drawn from specific experiences and illustrated using practical examples, many of which related to sustainable use. Ms. Normand concluded the presentation by pointing out that the UEBT report connected each target of the zero draft to a principle from the UEBT Ethical Biotrade Standard. She noted that the principles were very comprehensive and useful for application on the ground.

18. Mr. Francis Ogwal and Mr. Basile van Havre, Co-Chairs of the Open-ended Working Group on the Post-2020 Global Biodiversity Framework, gave a presentation on sustainable use in the draft post-2020 global biodiversity framework. Mr. Ogwal first gave an overview of the context of the post-2020 framework. He went over the overarching principles of the framework, highlighting the importance that it be participatory and inclusive. He then explained the timeline for the framework, noting that the outcomes of this thematic consultation would feed into the report on the twenty-fourth meeting of the Subsidiary Body on Scientific, Technical and Technological Advice and the third meeting of the Open-ended Working Group. He also explained the roles of the co-leads. Mr. Ogwal indicated that it was important to ensure the framework be coherent and effective. Mr. Ogwal then focused on sustainable use in the framework. He highlighted specific targets related to sustainable use where concrete suggestions were requested, which included Targets 4, 8, 9, 13 and 15. Mr. van Havre then explained how these five targets were related to each other, showing how Target 4 aims to reduce the threats of unsustainable use, while Targets 8 and 9 aim to ensure people's needs are met through the use of wild and domesticated species, respectively. Mr. van Havre also highlighted key messages related to sustainable use from previous thematic consultations, including the consultations on area-based conservation measures, marine ecosystems, access and benefit-sharing and implementation. He concluded the presentation by relaying the co-chair's advice and expectations for the consultation. The Co-Chairs of the Open-ended Working Group were looking for concrete and easily implementable recommendations on elements that would inform the next draft of the

framework. Mr. van Havre encouraged participants to be innovative, to provide links to other parts of the framework and to identify trade-offs and implications. He also reminded participants that this was an opportunity to provide expert advice to Parties, therefore there was no need to reach consensus.

19. The co-leads wrapped up the webinar and reiterated the need for clear, concrete suggestions to strengthen sustainable use in the post-2020 framework. They encouraged everyone to engage in the online survey and the rest of the activities of the consultation.

20. Further detail regarding the presentations, the question-and-answer sessions and the discussion session is provided in annex I and all presentation slides as well as the opening webinar recording are available on the sustainable use consultation [website](#).

## **SECTION 2. ONLINE SURVEY**

21. The second activity of the virtual thematic consultation was an online survey, which was made available to participants following the opening webinar. The online survey was available from 27 July to 18 August 2020. The survey was prepared under the supervision of the co-leads of the consultation and in close collaboration with the Co-Chairs of the Open-ended Working Group on the Post-2020 Global Biodiversity Framework. Participants had the option to submit their responses through an online platform or by email.

22. The online survey consisted of three sections.

(a) The first section focused on the overall inclusion of sustainable use of biological diversity concepts in the draft post-2020 global biodiversity framework. This section contained 4 questions covering the draft goals, milestones, targets and monitoring framework;

(b) The second section focused on the draft monitoring framework. This section contained six questions, covering Targets 4, 8, 9, 13 and 15, and any other target that may be relevant to sustainable use;

(c) The third section focused on customary sustainable use. This section contained three questions regarding how customary sustainable use can be strengthened in the framework.

23. A total of 86 responses were submitted to the Secretariat, including 33 from Parties and other Governments, 22 from NGOs, 8 from indigenous groups, 6 from the private sector, 5 from intergovernmental organizations, 3 from programmes or specialized agencies of the United Nations, 3 from academia, 3 from conventions and other agreements (Secretariat units), 2 from youth and 1 from a local authority.

24. A preliminary compilation of some of the points raised in the survey was prepared and made available to participants on the consultation [website](#) to support the discussions in the online forum.

25. A summary of the survey responses is provided in annex II. In addition, a compilation of changes and additions to the draft monitoring framework suggested in the online survey is provided in annex III.

26. The complete list of questions from the online survey is provided in annex IV.

## **SECTION 3. ONLINE DISCUSSION FORUM**

27. The third activity of the virtual consultation was an online discussion forum and was held from 7 to 11 September 2020. All participants who registered for the consultation in July were invited to participate in the online forum by subscribing to one or more threads.

28. Participants were invited to consider a number of guiding questions under five separate threads related to sustainable use. The thread topics and questions were based on some of the preliminary results of the online survey and were prepared under the supervision of the co-leads of the consultation and in close collaboration with the Co-Chairs of the Open-ended Working Group on the Post-2020 Global Biodiversity Framework. The following topics were included in the threads of the forum:



- (a) Sustainable harvest, trade and use of biodiversity;
  - (b) Ensuring benefits to people through sustainable use;
  - (c) Sustainable use of biological diversity across sectors;
  - (d) Customary sustainable use;
  - (e) General comments and questions relating to the sustainable use of biodiversity within the monitoring framework of the draft post-2020 global biodiversity framework.
29. A total of over 160 comments were posted to the forum. There were 44 participants in the forum in total, including 11 Parties, 15 NGOs, 1 indigenous group, 1 from the private sector, 7 from intergovernmental organizations, 3 from programmes or specialized agencies of the United Nations, 3 from academia and 1 from a Convention (Secretariat unit).
30. The online discussion forum can be accessed on the sustainable use consultation [website](#).
31. A preliminary summary of the forum discussions was made available to participants in advance of the closing webinar.
32. A summary of the discussions held in the online forum is provided in annex II.
33. In addition, a compilation of changes or additions to the draft monitoring framework suggested in the online forum is provided in annex III.
34. The complete list of questions from the online discussion forum is provided in annex V.

#### **SECTION 4. CLOSING WEBINAR**

35. The final activity of the virtual consultation was a closing webinar. Two identical closing webinars were held on 6 and 8 October 2020 to accommodate different time zones.
36. An opening statement was made by Mr. Alexander Shestakov, Director of the Science, Society and Sustainable Futures Division, CBD Secretariat. He outlined the agenda of the closing webinar and gave instructions on how to use the webinar platform. He also thanked the co-leads of the consultation for their guidance and support throughout the consultation.
37. The co-leads of the consultation, Ms. Martha Mphatso Kalemba and Mr. Norbert Barlocher, then presented the preliminary results from the online survey and discussion forum. Ms. Kalemba first gave an overview of the activities of the consultation and their levels of participation. They then presented key messages for each of the six themes that emerged from the online consultation, including:
- (a) Sustainable use of biological diversity in the post-2020 global biodiversity framework;
  - (b) Sustainable harvest, trade and use of biodiversity;
  - (c) Ensuring benefits to people through the sustainable use of biodiversity;
  - (d) Sustainable use of biodiversity in managed ecosystems;
  - (e) Mainstreaming and sustainable use of biodiversity across sectors;
  - (f) Sustainable consumption;
  - (g) Customary sustainable use.
38. Participants were split into breakout groups (six groups on 6 October and five groups on 8 October) to further discuss the outcomes of the online survey and discussion forum and identify key messages and priorities. The small group discussions focused on identifying key messages related to the six aforementioned themes on the sustainable use of biodiversity in the post-2020 global biodiversity framework.



39. The results from the breakout group sessions were reported back to the plenary by facilitators and are summarized in annex II.
40. The Co-Chairs of the Working Group then provided their reflections on the outcomes of the consultation. They thanked the co-leads and all the participants for the useful and concrete suggestions on elements of sustainable use in the post-2020 framework which will help inform the third meeting of the Open-ended Working Group and the first draft of the framework.
41. A closing statement was made by the co-leads of the consultation. Mr. Barlocher explained the next steps in the process of the consultation. He reiterated that the report of the consultation would be ready towards the end of November and would be submitted to the Subsidiary Body on Scientific, Technical and Technological Advice at its twenty-fourth meeting as an information document. The co-leads concluded by thanking the participants for being part of the consultation, the facilitators for guiding the discussions and the Secretariat for their support during the process.
42. The consultation was closed on Thursday, 8 October 2020.

*Annex I***OPENING WEBINAR PRESENTATION SUMMARIES**

The present annex contains a detailed summary of the presentations made by experts on sustainable use during the opening webinar. All presentation slides and the webinar recordings are available on the meeting [website](#). This annex also contains detailed summaries of the question-and-answer sessions and the discussion session held during the opening webinar.

**Sustainable Use: Key Concepts by Ms. Dilys Roe, Chair of the IUCN Sustainable Use and Livelihoods Specialist Group**

Ms. Dilys Roe, Chair of the IUCN Sustainable Use and Livelihoods Specialist Group, International Union for Conservation of Nature, presented the key concepts of sustainable use. Ms. Roe reminded attendees that sustainable use was one of the three foundational pillars of the CBD. She provided the definition of sustainable use, as defined under the Convention, and listed the agreements by Parties for sustainable use under Article 10 of the Convention text. Ms. Roe then reviewed the CBD Addis Ababa Principles and Guidelines for the Sustainable use of Biodiversity, and their emphasis on sustainable use as a tool for biodiversity conservation and human benefits as well as an end goal. She then noted that sustainable use was important in other biodiversity conventions, including CITES, CMS, Ramsar and provided their respective definitions of sustainable use. She also noted that IUCN developed a policy statement on the Sustainable Use of Wild Living Resources, which emphasized the importance of sustainable use as an important conservation tool because of the social and economic benefits that it delivered to people. Ms. Roe then explained that different perceptions of sustainable use existed, either as a dynamic process towards a desirable end state (e.g. the CBD definition), or as a tool for biodiversity conservation and human benefit. These perceptions were not exclusive and could be complementary (as seen in CBD decision [VII/12](#)), but they were also not interchangeable (e.g. some only think of sustainable use as a tool for human benefit). It was important when discussing sustainable use to be clear from which standpoint different advocates were coming from. Ms. Roe then explained that sustainable use applied to wildlife, agriculture, fisheries, forests and other natural resource sectors and involved a wide range of practices. Sustainable use could also have different purposes, including subsistence, commercial or recreational, spiritual and cultural purposes. Sustainable use was also driven by different stakeholders, including governments, the private sector or indigenous peoples and local communities. She also explained the differences between lethal and non-lethal consumptive use and non-consumptive sustainable use. She noted that even non-consumptive uses could sometimes have unintended impacts on the environment. Ms. Roe then explained the four different possible positions for being pro-sustainable use, including:

- (a) The person supports making use sustainable and is against unsustainable use;
- (b) The person supports sustainable use that benefits conservation and is against strict conservation approaches;
- (c) The person supports sustainable use that benefits humans and is against having no use;
- (d) The person supports all use and is against having no use.

Ms. Roe then went over how these different positions on sustainable use were currently reflected in different targets of the draft post-2020 global biodiversity framework, where Target 4 aimed to ensure all use is sustainable; Target 3 aimed to support sustainable use as a conservation tool; and Target 8 aimed to support sustainable use as a human development tool. She concluded by reiterating that sustainable use was fundamental to the Convention and it was important to consider the different uses, drivers, impacts and perceptions of sustainable use.

**Assessment of Sustainable Use of Wild Species by Mr. John Donaldson and Ms. Marla R. Emery, Co-Chairs of the Thematic Assessment on Sustainable Use of Wild Species, Intergovernmental Science-Policy Platform on Biodiversity and Ecosystem Services**

Ms. Marla Emery and Mr. John Donaldson, Co-Chairs of the Thematic Assessment on Sustainable Use of Wild Species, Intergovernmental Science-Policy Platform on Biodiversity and Ecosystem Services (IPBES), presented an overview of the process of the IPBES Assessment on Sustainable Use. Ms. Emery noted that the assessment outlined approaches to enhance the sustainable use of wild species, examined extractive and non-extractive uses and recognized the inseparable unity of nature and humanity. The assessment was divided into six chapters. A second order draft of the assessment as well as a first draft summary for policymakers would be available in January 2021. The final assessment would go to the IPBES Plenary in 2022. The document took a socioecological approach to the sustainable use of wild species and was being carried out by a multidisciplinary team of 75 experts from 38 countries. The document incorporated both scientific literature and indigenous and local knowledge. Mr. Donaldson then explained the framework for the assessment, which considered animal, plant, fungi and algae taxa. He also explained how the assessment defined wild species, taking into consideration context, purpose and world view. There were three variables considered when evaluating the wildness of a species, including: degree of human intervention in survival and productivity; degree of human mediated distribution; and degree of genetic selection of traits. Depending on the levels of each of these three variables, a species may be labelled: “wild in its original habitat”, “wild managed”, “introduced”, “feral”, “captive” or “domesticated”. Ms. Emery then explained that, in the assessment, sustainable use was considered a dynamic and complex socioecological process that required appropriate indicators to measure the achievement of both its social and ecological dimensions. The assessment of status and trends built on other assessments of the status of species in use and assessed trends in sustainable use. This information would help inform baselines for the post-2020 targets. The document also aimed to understand the drivers of sustainable use and explored plausible futures and target-seeking scenarios to identify leverage points and pathways to drive transformative change. Ms. Emery noted that policies on sustainable use had to balance social and ecological dimensions and recognize that responses operated at different scales. Many successful examples of sustainable use in local communities existed but scaling these responses up could be a challenge. Mr. Donaldson concluded by noting that a challenge for the post-2020 global biodiversity framework would be to identify what was required to transition towards a just and sustainable use of wild species.

**Question and answer - Session 1**

Following the two presentations, questions from participants raised in the chat were addressed. The following points were addressed:

(a) One participant asked when the IPBES *Assessment* would be published. Ms. Emery indicated that it would be published in March 2022, a short time after the IPBES Plenary;

(b) Another participant asked if there was a problem with having different understandings of sustainable use. Ms. Roe answered that it was not a problem, however it was important to recognize the different perceptions of sustainable use that different stakeholders may have. She mentioned that it was beneficial that the targets of the zero draft of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework covered different perceptions of sustainable use: there was a target that aimed to reduce unsustainable use; a target that applied sustainable use as a tool to conserve biodiversity; and a target that ensured socioeconomic benefits from sustainable use. She noted that it was then important to ensure that the indicators of these targets measured these components of sustainable use effectively.

**Sustainable Use: Strengthening our Relationship with Nature by Mr. Kim Friedman, Senior Fishery Resources Officer, Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations**

Mr. Kim Friedman, Senior Fishery Resources Officer for the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations gave a presentation on sustainable use in agriculture, fisheries and forestry. Mr. Friedman started the presentation by giving an overview of how our perception of nature had changed through time, where we had moved from considering nature as a balanced and stable biological system, to recognizing it

as a complex and dynamic socioecological system. This new paradigm highlighted the connection between biodiversity and people. Our planet's population and gross world product was increasing, and this was important when considering our conservation goals and food production goals. Traditionally, conservation had relied on exclusionary approaches, through protected areas. Yet, we knew that successful biodiversity conservation existed outside of national parks, and the Aichi Biodiversity Targets recognized the broad set of actors that were relevant for biodiversity conservation, many of which had been previously disenfranchised. He said that they now needed to shift their focus to areas where human-nature interactions occurred, to engage and empower the communities that relied on biodiversity for their food and livelihoods to become part of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework. The post-2020 framework needed to recognize the interconnectedness of social and ecological systems to bring about transformative change. Sustainable use was important for the delivery of outcomes in the post-2020 framework because:

- (a) People rely on biodiversity for a range of benefits;
- (b) Productivity hotspots are also 'use' hotspots;
- (c) Users and markets need to be engaged to join the post-2020 conversation;
- (d) Biodiversity action needs investment and political attention. Encouraging sustainable use can also help counter the impact of unsustainable use.

Mr. Friedman concluded the presentation with four key messages:

- (a) Sustainable use required active management of wild and domesticated biodiversity at all levels;
- (b) Solutions needed to balance conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity are critical and possible;
- (c) We need to build on successful initiatives and existing indicators;
- (d) It is crucially important we enable and support the mainstreaming of people's sustainable relationship with nature.

### **Sustainable wildlife management in the post-2020 global biodiversity framework by Ms. Kristina Rodina, Secretary, Collaborative Partnership on Sustainable Wildlife Management**

Ms. Kristina Rodina, Secretary from the Collaborative Partnership on Sustainable Wildlife Management (CPW) gave a presentation on sustainable wildlife management. Ms. Rodina started by giving an overview of the activities of the CPW, which was comprised of 14 partners. In June 2019, CPW organized a consultative workshop on Sustainable Wildlife Management Beyond 2020. The report of this workshop was brought to the 18<sup>th</sup> meeting of the CITES Conference of the Parties as well as the first meeting of the Open-ended Working Group for the Post-2020 Global Biodiversity Framework. In November 2019, CPW gave a keynote presentation on sustainable wildlife management at the twenty-third meeting of the Subsidiary Body on Scientific, Technical and Technological Advice. In March 2020, CPW organized a virtual workshop on wildlife harvest, use and trade targets and indicators for the post-2020 framework. CPW believed that Targets 3 and 14 of the framework were relevant to sustainable use, in addition to Targets 4, 8, 9, 13 and 15. They provided the following recommendations for these targets:

For Target 3:

- Need to clarify what is meant by "reduction of human-wildlife conflict" as this can be interpreted in many different ways.
- Suggested monitoring elements:
  - Species and conservation areas
  - People and communities
  - Economic impacts
  - Capacity, knowledge and policy

- Suggested indicators:
  - Proportion of human-wildlife conflict (HWC)-affected species populations
  - Number of people affected by HWC
  - Economic and livelihood costs of HWC
  - Capacity of communities, governments, NGOs, and other actors to manage HWC
  - Policies and strategies at national level and resources for HWC management and prevention

For Target 4:

- The principles of sustainability, legality and traceability need to be integrated.
- Clear definitions of harvest, trade and use are needed.
- The concept of scale also needs to be better integrated in the target by differentiating between subsistence and commercial uses, as well as national and international trade.
- Monitoring elements need to be inclusive of all taxa, habitats and ownership types.
- Elements of this target should also include the implementation of regulatory and non-regulatory measures.
- The partnership also suggested the following indicators for this target:
  - Change in the number of species threatened by international trade.
  - Trends in down-listing of CITES-listed species and decrease in CITES compliance interventions.
  - Change in the number of countries that implement the CBD voluntary guidance on sustainable wild meat sector.
  - Change in the number of species included in the IUCN Green Status of Species.
  - Number of countries with wildlife use and trade-related regulations and laws in place.

For Target 8:

- There is overlap between target 4 and 8.
- Monitoring elements are currently too focused on fisheries, all wild species should be considered.
- The concept of benefits needs to be defined and all categories of benefits should be considered.
- Other uses need to be included, such as fashion, lifestyle, and pets, not just food and medicine.
- Benefits and costs along the trade chain should be considered.
- More equitable distribution of benefits along value chains should be promoted, especially for indigenous peoples and local communities.
- The partnership also suggested some examples of initiatives relevant to this target:
  - The North American Wild Harvest Initiative (Conservation Visions, IUCN).
  - Sustainable Wildlife Management Programme (FAO, CIFOR, CIRAD, WCS).
  - CITES livelihoods case studies.
  - People not Poaching: Communities and IWT Learning and Platform (IIED, IUCN-SULi, TRAFFIC).
  - FairWild Initiative (TRAFFIC).

For Target 13, the partnership believes wild species of fauna and flora in use and trade should be recognized as part of the wider biodiversity, and the impact on them should be reflected in various elements.

For Target 14, many supply chains include wild-sourced species and products and there is scope for reforming economic sectors towards sustainable practices along the supply chains for wildlife trade.

For Target 15, the inclusion of the contribution of wild species to sustainable and responsible consumption practices and demand reduction for illegally traded wildlife.

The CPW also developed guiding principles to prevent the spread of zoonotic diseases. The principles are as follows:

- (a) Recognize the importance of the use of wildlife for many communities, including indigenous peoples and local communities, in policy response;
- (b) Maintain and restore healthy and resilient ecosystems to reduce risks of zoonotic spill overs and future pandemics;
- (c) Regulate, manage, and monitor harvesting, trade and use of wildlife to ensure it is safe, sustainable, and legal;
- (d) Persecution, including killing of wild animals suspected to transmit diseases, will not address the causes of the emergence, or spread of zoonotic diseases.

Ms. Rodina concluded the presentation by highlighting that the post-2020 framework represented an important opportunity to address issues related to biodiversity and human health through multi-sectoral collaboration.

## **Question and answer - Session 2**

Following the two presentations, a second question-and-answer session was held. The following points were addressed:

- (a) One participant asked how to shift focus from avoidance strategies towards sustainable use. Mr. Friedman answered that protected areas were an important tool for biodiversity conservation that could complement sustainable use practices. He emphasized that communities were ready to be engaged. In landscapes where the bulk of production was occurring and where avoidance strategies were not feasible, communities should be encouraged to minimize poor practices and increase sustainable use;
- (b) Another participant asked how traditional knowledge could be integrated in management plans. Mr. Friedman answered that consideration had to be given to whether the current indicators included in the monitoring framework were accessible to indigenous peoples and local communities. He encouraged all stakeholders, as appropriate, to discuss what worked in the post-2020 framework and what did not;
- (c) Another participant asked how to mainstream biodiversity across sectors. Ms. Rodina answered that the post-2020 global biodiversity framework should provide clear definitions for all terms, to ensure we were all working from a shared understanding of the goals and targets. Mr. Friedman relayed the results of a poll done with the fisheries and aquaculture community during the Virtual Dialogues on the Path to the 34<sup>th</sup> Session of the FAO Committee on Fisheries. In that poll, some stakeholders felt aligned but disconnected with the post-2020 framework. Mr. Friedman indicated that providing support for stakeholders could be more important than finding the perfect indicator. In addition, Mr. Friedman stated that goals should not be too prescriptive, they should be broad and capture people's imaginations.

## **Customary Sustainable Use: One Universal Agenda, Diverse ways of Knowing and Doing towards Renewing Nature and Cultures by Ms. Joji Carino, Senior Policy Advisor, Forest Peoples Programme**

Ms. Joji Carino, Senior Policy Advisor for the Forest Peoples Programme, gave a presentation on customary sustainable use. Ms. Carino began by explaining that customary sustainable use was an element of two cross-cutting issues of the Convention, Article 8(j) on in situ conservation and Article 10(c) and (d) on sustainable use. Customary sustainable use (CSU) was relevant to all three objectives of the Convention. There were countless examples of communities living in harmony with nature, thus, sustainable use was not an end point, it was a relationship. Customary sustainable use embodied historical and intergenerational human interactions with nature. Some examples included agroforestry and rotational farming in Asia and the Tropics, revitalization of mangroves and coral reefs on islands, pastoralism in drylands and reindeer herding in Europe and the Russian Federation. CSU had so far been underrecognized, undervalued and

underreported within the Convention, and this was a missed opportunity. It was well established that the territories, lands and waters of indigenous peoples and local communities were biodiversity hotspots but also faced enormous pressures from large-scale extractive industries, agriculture and infrastructure development. For indigenous peoples and local communities and all of humanity, the continuation of CSU would strongly determine whether we achieved our 2050 vision of living in harmony with nature and the 2030 milestone targets. At the twelfth meeting of the Conference of the Parties, Parties approved a plan of action on CSU. However, the *Global Biodiversity Outlooks* report concluded that Aichi Target 18, focused on mainstreaming CSU and traditional knowledge, had not been met. The post-2020 framework must promote the interlinkages between biological and cultural diversity, and it must accommodate diverse ways of knowing and doing. Society and people must be at the centre of the post-2020 biodiversity strategy. The Universal Declaration of Human Rights must inform and guide the post-2020 framework, addressing systemic problems of impoverishment and social inequalities at the root of the biodiversity crisis. Equitable decision-making over rights to resources needed to be embedded in the framework. Targets 19 and 20 were cross-cutting themes, which should be standalone elements in the strategy. Some specific examples of how CSU could be better integrated across the framework were given.

For Target 1:

- Land tenure of indigenous peoples and local communities needs to be secured by this target, since what is considered “natural ecosystems” in most cases are lands of indigenous peoples and local communities with low human impact.
- Suggested indicator: Trends in extent and quality of seemingly “natural” critical ecosystems with low human impact, including territories, lands and waters of indigenous peoples and local communities, as a distinct land use category.
- Suggested monitoring element: Increased extent and security of customary land tenure of indigenous peoples and local communities.

For Target 4:

- Suggested addition to target: taking into account and respecting customary sustainable use of indigenous peoples and local communities.
- In the past, what has been considered illegal has often been discriminatory and subsistence use has been criminalized. However, there are many unwritten rules and laws that protect against overexploitation in customary uses.

For Target 8:

- Suggested component: Customary sustainable use of wild flora and fauna
  - Monitoring and indicators through community-based monitoring and information systems, through qualitative ground truthing and case studies which can complement quantitative global and national indicators
- Suggested indicators:
  - Trends in securing land and resources of indigenous peoples and local communities
  - Trends in customary sustainable use practices documented by community-based monitoring and information systems (CBMIS)
  - Trends in the practice of traditional occupations

Ms. Carino concluded by noting that there were very few indicators for CSU and traditional knowledge in the current monitoring framework. Once the global framework was approved, she suggested that a process would be needed to operationalize CSU indicators whereby indigenous peoples and local communities, scientists and other stakeholders could come together in a technical process to address the missing indicators in the framework.



**Community-based Natural Resource Management: Southern African Context by Ms. Maxi Louis, Director, Namibian Association of Community-based Natural Resource Management Support Organizations**

Ms. Maxi Louis, Director of the Namibian Association of Community-based Natural Resources Management Support Organizations, gave a presentation on community-based resource management. Ms. Louis began by explaining that the community-based natural resource management programme had conserved a large number of natural resources and had ensured benefits for the communities involved. Targets 4, 8, 15 and 20 were especially relevant to the issue of sustainable use. Ms. Louis then explained what community-based natural resource management entailed for the South African context. It was a global strategy that enhanced conservation outcomes, affecting issues around climate change. It allowed communities to have control over land uses that would be able to address their needs, allowing them to use natural resources as a driver for economic growth. Equitable resource use was key to ensure that habitats were protected. It empowered communities and improved livelihoods and involved adaptive management systems. There needed to be an enabling environment for communities to participate, thus legal frameworks were important. It must be sustainable, and communities must be accountable, respectful and transparent. Communities wanted to be equal partners in every investment in their natural resources. They wanted to be shareholders and not just users. She listed the following:

Sustainable use is important because:

- It contributes to viable rural economies, biodiversity conservation, economic development, food security, health and cultural traditions.
- It provides a range of benefits, including food, medicine, jobs, and spiritual well-being.
- Many people depend on sustainable use for their livelihoods and have no other income options.
- It incentivizes species and habitat conservation.
- It protects land for biodiversity.
- It offsets costs of living alongside dangerous animals.

However, it is important to address barriers to sustainable use, which include:

- Conflict between people and wildlife.
- Weak tenure, poor recognition or enforcement of local rights - without rights it is extremely difficult for communities to manage their own resources.
- Unequal distribution of costs and benefits from wildlife where issues of social justice are left unaddressed.
- Powerful external interests that seek to undermine local peoples' rights.

Ms. Louis then gave an account of her experiences in Namibia, where giving rights to communities had helped ensure the protection of habitats. When you increase their economic value, communities become more tolerant and respectful towards wildlife, and social benefits and empowerment for communities increase. Overall, this led to habitat protection in the long term. Ms. Louis concluded by saying that community conservation was at the heart of the Southern African economy and future development plans. We need to empower and give rights to communities so we can ensure they protect our environment.

**The Big Shift. Business for biodiversity: Lessons learned from over 10 years of the Union for Ethical Biotrade by Ms. Valerie Normand, Senior Expert on Access and Benefit-sharing, Union for Ethical Biotrade**

Ms. Valerie Normand, Senior Expert on Access and Benefit-sharing (ABS) for the Union for Ethical Biotrade, gave a presentation on sustainable use in the private sector. Mrs. Normand began by giving an

overview of the Union for Ethical BiTrade (UEBT), a non-profit association that promotes ethical sourcing of ingredients from biodiversity. She said that UEBT supported and verified the commitments of companies in the food, cosmetic, natural pharmaceutical, personal care, flavours and fragrances sectors to sourcing with respect to people and biodiversity. The UEBT Ethical BiTrade Standard was at the core of UEBT's work and was based on seven principles, three of which were directly related to the objectives of the Convention, including sustainable use. The standard was organized in principles, criteria and indicators. The companies that worked with UEBT used small amounts of ingredients from biodiversity, particularly domesticated or wild plants, microorganisms and algae. UEBT had 58 members globally, sourcing from 68 countries, across over 700 supply chains, using 273 ingredients from biodiversity.

As a contribution to the post-2020 global biodiversity framework, UEBT had created a report detailing lessons learned over their past 10 years of work. There were 10 lessons, each drawn from specific experiences and illustrated by practical examples, many of which were related to sustainable use. The report was useful for businesses and policymakers. The lessons were the following:

(a) Biodiversity is our business: companies increasingly recognize the extent to which their products and operations depend on conserving and sustainably using biodiversity;

(b) Biodiversity is a consumer expectation: UEBT annually measures consumer awareness of biodiversity and how this affects purchasing decisions. Over the last decade, consumer awareness of biodiversity has expanded but their trust in companies to respect biodiversity has decreased. Companies should use this as an opportunity to meet consumer expectations;

(c) Biodiversity means engaging on the ground: A significant gap exists between company commitments and their implementation on the ground. UEBT members are required to take concrete action on the ground to improve local biodiversity;

(d) Standards are tools for biodiversity action: independent standards can provide guidance on good social and environmental practices. They provide impartiality, transparency and drive new commitments in ethical sourcing;

(e) People and biodiversity are inherently linked: long-term investments are needed to lift people out of poverty and conserve local biodiversity. Ethical sourcing practices can contribute to local economic development, which also helps communities respect biodiversity;

(f) Recognizing rights over biodiversity is essential: UEBT assists companies in respecting national ABS rules while developing products in a manner that respects people and biodiversity and contributes to conservation and sustainable use;

(g) Biodiversity is part of company strategies, operations and supply chains: ownership of biodiversity actions must lie at the senior management level. The commitment to conserve and sustainably use biodiversity must be integrated in company strategies, operations and supply chains. Both companies and suppliers can then obtain a range of social and environmental benefits;

(h) Biodiversity actions are effective when tailored to the local context: actions work for biodiversity when they are fine-tuned to local realities, involve producers and complement existing local strategies;

(i) Biodiversity regeneration is the next step: companies at the forefront are beginning to think about regenerating biodiversity. Regeneration should be focused in and also around sourcing areas;

(j) Biodiversity means working in partnership: partnerships can occur across different levels in the supply chain. Companies should strengthen local collaboration and empower local suppliers. Sector wide exchanges drive change at the landscape or industry level;

Ms. Normand concluded the presentation by pointing out that the UEBT report connects each target of the zero draft to a principle from the UEBT Ethical BiTrade Standard. She noted that the principles are very comprehensive and useful for application on the ground.

**Question and answer - Session 3**

Following the three presentations, a third question-and-answer session was held. The following points were addressed:

(a) One participant asked whether voluntary standards and actions by companies were sufficient or if there was a need for stronger regulation. Ms. Normand answered that the UEBT Ethical Biotrade Standards helped companies improve their practices. Companies engaged to continuously improve over the years and there were criteria and indicators to track their development. There were also minimum requirements to respect to become a UEBT member;

(b) Another participant asked what to do if the ecosystem could not handle the combined pressures put on it, including customary use. In addition, a participant asked if customary use was always sustainable. Ms. Carino clarified that by definition, customary sustainable use practices must be sustainable and respect biodiversity, and therefore produce positive conservation outcomes. Customary sustainable use did not include all customary uses, only those which were sustainable. Ms. Carino added that the post-2020 framework must support sustainable practices and protect customary sustainable uses from harm. Ms. Carino argued that CSU had been undervalued in the past because the focus on national development planning had been on large industrial sectors. Ms. Carino stated that, even in the current national biodiversity strategy and action plans 2011-2020, the sustainable use targets supported what was economically profitable but unsustainable, rather than actually supporting sustainable practices to make them more economically viable;

(c) Another participant asked how the process of working with local community members was when dealing with issues of accountability and transparency. Ms. Louis answered that NACSO had developed systems that involved a wide range of stakeholders, including government, NGOs and community members. Communities were aware that they must hold meetings to be accountable to their members and report back to higher levels of government. Communities were willing to be accountable because they had ownership of the resources. Ms. Louis explained that there were mechanisms in place at all levels of participating governments to ensure that the communities were accountable;

(d) Another participant asked about the drivers and incentives for companies to engage with the sustainable use of biodiversity. Ms. Normand answered that companies realized that it made economic sense to align with objectives of the Convention given that they relied on biodiversity. Consumer pressure was growing, which was an opportunity for companies to make changes at the ground level. Regulations and standards were also useful. Ms. Normand noted that a combination of approaches was useful in further encouraging companies to mainstream biodiversity in their activities;

(e) Another participant asked about the concept of low human impact in territories of indigenous peoples and local communities. Ms. Carino answered that there were few remaining natural ecosystems in the world today that had no interactions with humans. Therefore, when further conservation was demanded in seemingly natural areas, these were actually areas with low human impact. However, some of these areas had strong human management by indigenous peoples, where the impact of the human activity was low because of the cultural relations with nature. For example, there were many cultural laws that dictated that resources must be allowed to regenerate. Ms. Carino added that there were concerns that the current framework reinforced divisions between nature and people instead of supporting relational values and balance in human nature relationships. Instead of referring to natural areas, the framework should acknowledge that those were areas of low human impact, when appropriate;

(f) Another participant asked if trophy hunting could be sustainable in the long term. Ms. Louis answered that trophy hunting could be sustainable and used as a conservation tool if implemented properly. Ms. Louis highlighted the importance for the decision to trade with trophy hunters to come from within the community, whereas a decision enforced from outside the community could be unsustainable.

**Development of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework. Post-2020 Thematic Consultations: Sustainable Use of Biological Diversity by Mr. Francis Ogwal and Mr. Basile van Havre, Co-chairs of the Open-ended Working Group on the Post-2020 Global Biodiversity Framework**

Mr. Francis Ogwal and Mr. Basile van Havre, Co-chairs of the Open-ended Working Group on the Post-2020 Global Biodiversity Framework, gave a presentation on sustainable use in the draft post-2020 global biodiversity framework. Mr. Ogwal first gave an overview of the context of the post-2020 framework. He went over the overarching principles of the draft framework, highlighting the importance that it be participatory and inclusive. The framework was for all, and all stakeholders must be on board, which was challenging but rewarding, since human beings all depended on biodiversity. He then explained the timeline for the framework, noting that the outcomes of the thematic consultation would feed into the report on the twenty-fourth meeting of the Subsidiary Body on Scientific, Technical and Technological Advice and the third meeting of the Working Group on the Post-2020 Global Biodiversity Framework. He then went on to explain the organization of work for this consultation. The co-chairs would like concrete advice and recommendations to help draft the next version of the framework and to support the negotiations. He also explained the roles of the co-leads, which included to organize and facilitate the consultations, to chair the consultations and assist the Co-Chairs of the Working Group, as required and possible, up to the end of the post-2020 process. Mr. Ogwal also highlighted that it was important to ensure the framework is coherent and effective. Joint planning and reporting opportunities with other UNEP instruments should be explored. Duplication of work should be avoided but synergies should be captured. Mr. Ogwal then focused on sustainable use in the framework, noting that sustainable use was one of the 2050 goals but was also a cross-cutting issue that related to all aspects of the framework, including the sections on Reducing Threats, Meeting Peoples Needs and Tools and Solutions. He highlighted specific targets related to sustainable use where concrete suggestions were requested, including Targets 4, 8, 9, 13 and 15. Mr. van Havre then explained how these 5 Targets were related to each other, showing how Target 4 aimed to reduce the threats of unsustainable use, while Targets 8 and 9 aimed to ensure people's needs through the use of wild and domesticated species were met, respectively. Mr. van Havre also highlighted key messages related to sustainable use from previous thematic consultations, including the consultations on area-based conservation measures, marine ecosystems, access and benefit-sharing and implementation. He concluded the presentation by explaining the Co-Chairs' advice and expectations for the consultation. The Co-Chairs were looking for concrete and easily implementable recommendations on elements that would inform the next draft of the framework. The Co-Chairs and Parties needed clearly worded recommendations they could use to support their own negotiating positions. Mr. van Havre encouraged participants to be innovative, to provide links to other parts of the framework and to identify trade-offs and implications. He also reminded participants that this was an opportunity to provide expert advice to Parties, therefore there was no need to reach consensus.

**Discussion session**

The presentation was followed by a discussion session. The following points were discussed:

(a) The Co-Chairs explained that all the targets are connected and complement each other. Target 17 on subsidies and incentives supports the targets related to meeting people's needs. When people receive benefits from sustainable use, this acts as an important incentive to encourage sustainable use. Many types of interventions were possible to encourage this, depending on the context, including policies;

(b) The Co-Chairs noted an issue with the previous framework was that stakeholders relied on CBD focal points for its implementation. Biodiversity goals will only be achieved if all stakeholders are engaged, which is why this new framework aims to include all stakeholders. Many businesses in the private sector are dependent on biodiversity. Demonstrating to the private sector that sustainable use is good for their business in the long term is a way to engage them. It is important that private companies develop their own action plans that reflect sustainable use. We will need to observe and learn from what others have done to engage the private sector, by looking for example at how they have been engaged by the climate change issue and try to replicate this for the biodiversity issue. This will be further discussed at the third meetings of the Open-ended Working Group and the Subsidiary Body on Implementation.

*Annex II*

**SYNTHESIS OF DISCUSSIONS AND SUBMISSIONS MADE BY PARTICIPANTS  
THROUGHOUT THE VIRTUAL CONSULTATION ON THE SUSTAINABLE USE OF  
BIOLOGICAL DIVERSITY FOR THE POST-2020 GLOBAL BIODIVERSITY FRAMEWORK**

This annex presents a synthesis of the discussions and submissions made by participants throughout the virtual consultation on the sustainable use of biodiversity. The summaries of the activities of the consultation, including the online survey, the online discussion forum and closing webinars, have been organized thematically as follows:

- Sustainable use of biological diversity across the post-2020 global biodiversity framework
- Sustainable harvest, trade and use of biodiversity (closely related to Target 4)
- Ensuring benefits to people through the sustainable use of biodiversity (closely related to Target 8)
- Sustainable use of biodiversity in managed ecosystems (closely related to Target 9)
- Mainstreaming and sustainable use across sectors (closely related to Target 13)
- Sustainable consumption and production (closely related to Target 15)
- Customary sustainable use
- Terminology where clarification is needed
- Sustainable use of biodiversity in other targets of the framework
- General comments on the post-2020 global biodiversity framework with focus beyond the sustainable use of biodiversity

These summaries should not be interpreted in any way as a consensus nor as recommendation but, rather, as potential input for further discussions in the development of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework.

**Sustainable use of biological diversity across the post-2020 global biodiversity framework**

**Summary of participants' inputs:** Overall, many participants communicated the need to have more clarity and definition of concepts in the framework (e.g. integrity, healthy ecosystem, productivity gap, conservation, sustainable use). In particular, participants felt there is a need for well-defined holistic criteria for assessing sustainability if the goals and targets of the future global biodiversity framework for the sustainable use of biodiversity are to be achieved. Participants felt that the framework needs to emphasize sustainable use as a tool for biodiversity conservation and that sustainable use and conservation are mutually supportive goals. Enhancing language that values sustainable use was one suggestion. Some participants suggested that biodiversity mainstreaming, and good governance are tools that need to be addressed more prominently and effectively throughout the whole framework. Many participants also commented on the importance of enhancing vertical and horizontal integration of governments to support implementation of the framework. The strengthening of synergies between the framework and other international agreements, organizations and processes that relate to sustainable use (e.g. WTO, CITES, BRS, SDGs) was also suggested to avoid duplicating work, but also to engage other processes and stakeholders. Some participants commented that customary sustainable use and its linkages with the three objectives of the Convention need to be strengthened in the framework. Some participants felt the framework should have a more positive framing around species recovery and restoration, as opposed to simply maintaining current baselines and halting declines.

## Online survey

### Comments frequently raised by respondents of the online survey

- Some respondents noted that the contributions of human actions and activities to conservation, restoration, sustainable use and equitable benefit-sharing of biodiversity could be recognized, encouraged and strengthened in the framework.
- Many respondents highlighted the need to have more clarity and definition of concepts such as integrity, healthy ecosystem, productivity gap, conservation, sustainable use.
- The importance of mainstreaming for sustainable use, was also highlighted by many respondents.
- Some respondents highlighted that the current draft has some gaps in terms of ensuring equity for indigenous peoples and local communities. More specifically, respondents suggested to include customary sustainable use in Goal B. To support and complement this, it was suggested that Goal A could also have an element on recognition of lands, waters and territories of indigenous peoples and local communities.
- Many respondents highlighted that the current draft should recognize that use of biodiversity must be sustainable both inside and outside protected areas and other effective area-based conservation measures. Conservation and sustainable use are not mutually exclusive, and this should be strengthened in the framework. However, other respondents recommended a clearer distinction between targets and indicators that are about protection/conservation/threat reduction, and those that are about the management of consumptive or non-consumptive sustainable use regimes.
- Some respondents recommended more emphasis be put on national decision-making (plans and policies) around sustainable, legal and safe use and in the wider context of other policies, including conservation and management plans.
- Some respondents noted that an effective knowledge and technology transfer from developed nations is an important aspect of sustainable use that needs to be addressed in the framework.
- Some respondents suggested that the various uses of biological resources are not adequately represented in the indicators and monitoring elements of key sustainable use targets within the draft framework. One example given was non-consumptive uses of biodiversity (e.g. tourism).
- Some respondents suggested to modify the language used in the current framework, to a language that values sustainable use. Respondents also suggested to include language reflecting effective management and maintenance and support for resilience of ecosystem services. A direct mention of natural resource use sectors as partners in the Goals of the framework was noted as progressive and was advised.
- Some respondents argued that nature's contributions to people should be complemented by peoples' contributions to nature. Sustainable use is currently characterized as something that benefits people and is set apart from benefits to nature. The result of including people and sustainability in two groups of the global biodiversity framework can end up with these streams being in competition with each other, potentially undermining effectiveness and delivery in both subsets.
- Some respondents appreciated that each goal addresses each one of the objectives of the Convention and the fourth goal addresses the means of implementation (updated zero-draft).<sup>8</sup> However, others preferred to see sustainable use integrated across all goals and milestones. Others highlighted that

---

<sup>8</sup> The draft monitoring framework for the post-2020 global biodiversity framework made available for peer review for the twenty-fourth meeting of Subsidiary Body on Scientific, Technical and Technological Advice: <https://www.cbd.int/sbstta/sbstta-24/post2020-monitoring-en.pdf>

although “sustainable use” is referred to directly in Goal B, sustainable use is not sufficiently reflected in the milestones. Furthermore, others responded that in the draft for review there is no clear connection between goals, targets and milestones with respect to sustainable use.

### **Other comments raised by respondents of the online survey**

Some of the strengths highlighted by respondents:

- It is positive that the theory of change of the framework focuses on reducing the threats caused by the unsustainable use of biodiversity.
- The focus on the benefits to people that can be derived from sustainable use is a strength of the framework.
- The current structure focusing on nature’s contributions to people, which is consistent with the SDG framework and the relationship between nature (goal A), economy (NCPs in goal B) and society (equitable sharing in goal D) is also seen as a strength.
- The framework offers an opportunity for setting up a new set of incentives for building bridges between resource managers and biodiversity conservation communities.

Some of the gaps highlighted by respondents:

- The coverage of monitoring elements and indicators of nature’s contributions to people in the monitoring framework needs to be strengthened.
- Equality of benefit sharing from species and ecosystems, as in Goal C and Target 12, consistent with objective C of the Convention, only focuses on genetic resources.
- Goal B needs to be strengthened (for example B1 and B2 do not necessarily ensure sustainable use), and issues related to livelihoods could be incorporated into this Goal.
- The framework should recognize that sustainable use is also affected by such indirect drivers as poverty and population that can lead to overexploitation.
- Making the ecosystem approach more prominent throughout the sustainable use components of the global biodiversity framework would be useful.
- Marine issues are underrepresented and therefore need to be strengthened.
- There is a need to strengthen the three dimensions of sustainable development (economic, social and environmental) but within the scope of the Convention.
- The utilization of genetic resources is also a form of use, and could therefore be captured under both Goal A and B.

### **Online discussion forum**

The following comments were posted to the General thread of the discussion forum and relate to sustainable use across the post-2020 global biodiversity framework:

- Any use of biodiversity can only be sustainable if it leads to an increase in biodiversity; any system that merely seeks to maintain a situation ex ante is bound to fail, slowly or quickly. Sustainable use targets in the global biodiversity framework must therefore explicitly pursue an increase in the particular components of biodiversity involved.
- The global biodiversity framework should build on successful initiatives and existing processes that have been successful in their approaches.



- The framework should strive to define the thresholds, i.e. (a) establish in which ecological limits / planetary boundaries biodiversity can be used sustainably by different sectors and on different levels and (b) inform on measures needed to avoid/prevent any unsustainable use.
- The global biodiversity framework and monitoring framework should foster strong action to combat overexploitation, whether terrestrial or marine, and whether flora or fauna; that should include clear indicators on reduction in overexploitation, implementation of science-based management measures, etc., that can provide incentives to governments and others to eliminate unsustainable use/overexploitation. That is missing currently.
- It is vital to ensure that any use (consumptive or non-consumptive) of wild fauna and flora should be biologically, economically, and socially sustainable, but it is important to include in the framework that all use of wild fauna and flora that is not biologically, economically, and socially sustainable should end. The target, elements, and monitoring framework to date appear to advocate use, with the goal of hoping that it is sustainable. Rather, use that is unsustainable should be stopped or changed, such that there are incentives for it to become sustainable. There should be an increased emphasis on national decision-making (plans and policies) around sustainable and legal use, as called for in CBD Article 10 -- with measures designed to avoid or minimize adverse impacts on biological diversity (as per Article 10 (b)).
- To achieve the CBD targets, sustainable use needs to be the anchor and glue that delivers on all three goals of the Convention. By default, a sustainable use approach delivers benefits and conservation outcomes because it is people-centred and nature positive. Sustainability denotes the increasing value of nature while delivering on societal aspirations.
- Past biodiversity targets, such as the Aichi Biodiversity Targets, have mainly focused on conservation as a means to halt biodiversity loss. The issue of benefits under the Nagoya Protocol is narrowly defined with reference to genetic resources. Sustainable use presents a unique opportunity to deliver on all three goals of the Convention on Biological Diversity in a reinforcing manner.
- The SU concept enables a holistic approach to managing multiple objectives at the landscape level, placing people at the centre of decision-making and managing the trade-offs between competing interests so that we can not only create better resilience but also anticipate and avoid pandemics such as COVID-19.
- Sustainable use demands an effective and enforceable governance framework that includes policies and practices that govern the relationship between user groups and nature and hold them accountable to each other and society for their actions. Understanding the impact of power relations is critical if there is to be meaningful engagement with and empowerment of the shareholders and ultimate custodians of natural assets.
- Opportunities to use qualitative data and proxy indicators to assess sustainability at the local level should be encouraged and capacitated.

### **Closing webinar**

#### **Comments from breakout groups**

- Equitable governance needs to be reflected across the framework.
- Agriculture needs to be stressed more across the framework, with specific actions, recognizing its role as both a driver of biodiversity loss and as critical for sustainable use.
- Existing indicators available from other frameworks should be adopted as a way to avoid duplicating work, but also to engage other processes, communities, sectors, etc. (e.g. indicators from the monitoring framework for the United Nations Decade of Family Farming (2019-2028),

indicators from SDGs 2.3, 2.4 and 2.5; UNCCD land degradation neutrality targets; UNCLOS, and many others).

- The post-2020 global biodiversity framework should have a more positive framing around species recovery and restoration, as opposed to simply maintaining current baselines and halting declines.
- Use and conservation are mutually supportive; they should not be treated as oppositional. Sustainable use needs to be seen as a path to conserving nature.
- There is a need for well-defined holistic criteria for assessing sustainability.
- Sustainable use equals good stewardship – this is not well reflected in the framework.
- The One Health approach should be reflected in the framework, due to the current pandemic.
- All conventions related to biodiversity should work together on the topic of sustainable use. More attention could be given to the promotion of sustainable use of elements of biodiversity in human managed ecosystems to meet people's needs (e.g., food, fibre, fuel, tourism) and support conservation goals.
- The ecosystem approach could be more prominent throughout the sustainable use components of the global biodiversity framework.
- Sustainable use needs to benefit both nature and people in a holistic way and be based on equity.

#### **Sustainable harvest, trade and use of biodiversity (Target 4)**

**Summary of participants' inputs:** Overall, many respondents highlighted the need for clearer definitions of the terms in this target (e.g. safe, legal), since the current wording could lead to confusion and possible misinterpretation of the meaning of the target. With regards to the wording of Target 4 of the draft monitoring global biodiversity framework, a number of participants agreed that reference to the sustainability should be made before reference to legality in the wording of the target. Some suggested "fair" should also be added to the target. Participants also suggested that clarification is needed on which species are addressed in the target, as references to "wildlife" and "fauna and flora" in the target and monitoring elements may unnecessarily exclude species of plants, fungi and bacteria. Some participants agreed the use of the term "wild species" without the specification "of fauna and flora" would be most appropriate. Many participants argued that the monitoring framework should include indicators related to timber harvesting and also on detrimental impacts on non-target species and habitats. Some participants also felt that reference to integrated fisheries management plans are needed. Other respondents indicated that customary sustainable use (CSU) is overlooked in this target, and that the monitoring elements should ensure that harvesting, trade and use respect and recognize the rights of indigenous peoples to customary sustainable use. Many participants agreed that the focus should be on reducing unsustainable use and not just increasing sustainable use, thus both trends in illegal and legal uses should be monitored under this target, since data on both types of activities are needed in order to properly understand population trends of threatened species. In addition, quotas should not only be based on trade volumes, but all other drivers of biodiversity loss should be considered. Participants disagreed on whether wild species threatened with extinction (Critically Endangered (CR), Endangered (EN) and Vulnerable (VU)) should be excluded from extractive use in this target, since some argued that the sustainable use of these species is in fact an important conservation tool. However, most participants did agree that it is important to clearly define the criteria needed for a use to be considered sustainable, as this will allow positive conservation outcomes for any species, regardless of conservation status.

### Online survey

#### Comments frequently raised by respondents of the survey

##### *Target:*

- Some respondents indicated that the following terms need to be defined to avoid confusion: harvest, trade, use, safe, overexploitation, wild species, sustainable.
  - Many respondents suggested use of “ecologically sustainable” rather than “sustainable”.
- Others indicated that the word “legal” presents potential problems with the safeguarding of biodiversity, since certain practices may be legal but detrimental to biodiversity or may suggest a need to change laws that ban harvesting, trade and use of wildlife to make all such harvesting, trade and use, legal. In addition, some respondents also indicated that the focus on legality potentially excludes CSU and disregards rights of indigenous peoples and local communities and that sustainability should be prioritized over legality.
- Some disagreement exists among respondents on which terms are best when referring to species, comments included:
  - “All species should be covered in this target, not just wild species”
  - “Keep term “wild species” instead of “fauna and flora”, which excludes fungi and bacteria”
  - “Wildlife is often understood to mean only animals, which may lead to lack of reporting on trafficked timber and other plant species”
  - Replace “biological resources” with “wildlife”.
- Some respondents suggested to define or remove the word “safe” as presently, it is not clear for whom the use needs to be safe and no indicators exist to measure safety. Some respondents also argued it is beyond the scope of the CBD to measure trends in measures ensuring safety of trade operations (as these discussions are undertaken by WCO and WTO) and human health.
- Others indicated that timber harvesting is an important driver of biodiversity loss and should be explicitly included in this target.
- Some respondents also indicated that the following concepts could be included in the target:
  - Ecosystem-based approaches.
  - Avoiding detrimental impacts on non-target species and habitats. The indicator on bycatch which is currently linked to Target 8 is more properly linked to this target which is aiming to reduce drivers of biodiversity loss– over-exploitation in this case.
  - Harvest quotas should be within safe ecological limits, not just established limits.
- Some respondents suggested the target should aim for sustainable levels of wildlife use within the remit of increasing populations, not at current depleted levels. Other respondents also suggested that strictly protected species should be excluded from sustainable use, as should wild species threatened with extinction (CR, EN, VU) at national levels and that use of endangered or vulnerable species should only be used in non-extractive ways.

##### *Monitoring framework:*

- Some respondents of the survey indicated that there are a number of ways that CITES could provide useful information for some monitoring elements and as potential indicators. For example:

- There is a Resolution on Non-detriment findings<sup>9</sup> (NDFs) and a dedicated section on the CITES website on NDFs with many examples of best practice guidance (<https://www.cites.org/eng/prog/ndf/index.php>) that could also be applied to the management of non-CITES listed species.
- It was suggested to consider if NDFs could also be used as potential indicators, e.g. percentage of Parties with NDFs being implemented or with NDFs processes in place.
- For Target 4.2, another potential indicator could be to look at whether the quotas for international trade in CITES-listed species have been respected or not.
- In order to determine the proportion of trade wildlife poached or illicitly trafficked, the total volume of legal trade also needs to be determined. From an international trade perspective, the CITES trade databases (annual legal trade and annual illegal trade) can provide this information for CITES-listed species. At the national level and for non-CITES listed species, other data sets would be required.
- Regarding monitoring elements, some respondents pointed out that trends in illegal trade and harvesting need to be monitored as well as legal activities and that increasing legal harvesting does not mean illegal harvesting will be reduced. It was suggested to have specific wording in the text of the target, monitoring elements and indicators addressing illegality and unsustainable practices to fully recognize the role these play in biodiversity decline and over-exploitation.
  - However, other respondents argued that prohibitive policies do not always work where the use of biological diversity is needed and that promotion of sustainable use of biodiversity works better.
- Some respondents indicated that monitoring elements and indicators regarding CSU need to be included. Monitoring elements should ensure that harvesting, trade and use is respecting and recognizing the rights of indigenous peoples, including those of women, to customary use.

#### **Other comments raised by respondents of the survey**

- One respondent pointed out that “harvesting” is not a correct term for sentient animals, and that “exploitation” should be used instead.
- A suggestion was made to move this target from the broad elements of reducing threats to biodiversity to the section dealing with sustainable use of the components of biodiversity.
- Another suggestion was to align Target 4 with SDG 15.7, which explicitly mentions an end to poaching and trafficking of endangered species, and urgent action to address both demand and supply of illegal wildlife products.
- A suggestion was made to monitor human health, hygiene and zoonoses in relation to wildlife use.
- A suggestion was made to include an indicator on regeneration and domestication of biodiversity.
- A suggestion was made to consider new indicators across a wider range of taxa and on non-consumptive uses, such as wildlife tourism, to ensure balance.
- A respondent highlighted the importance of regularly monitoring population levels and distributions.
- It was also suggested that for each group of species (terrestrial and aquatic) that is exploited there needs to be agreement reached on the best techniques to estimate sustainable levels of use.

---

<sup>9</sup> Resolution Conf. 16.7 (Rev. CoP18).

- For monitoring, accurate data is important. Some respondents underlined the importance of synergies among multilateral environmental agreements to facilitate the use of data among different multilateral environmental agreements (e.g. CITES, CMS, Ramsar, etc.).

### Online discussion forum

The following questions were posted to the online discussion forum under the thread Sustainable Harvest, Trade and Use of Biodiversity:

*Forum Question 1. Which terms should be used in Targets 4: 'wildlife', 'wild species' or 'biological resources'? What would the implications of these different terms be for the monitoring framework of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework?*

- The majority of participants agreed that the term “wild species” should be used in Target 4, without special reference to “fauna and flora”, as this excludes species in the bacteria and fungi kingdoms. The term “wild species” encompasses all species affected by harvest, trade and use (including plants, animals, bacteria and fungi).
  - The term “wildlife” is often understood to mean terrestrial wild game and could lead to misinterpretation of the target.
  - The term “biological resources” is too broad and encourages the commodification of nature.
- A few participants argued the term “biological resources” should be used in the target, since it includes all species that are relevant to the target and the term is already defined in the Convention.
- A few participants argued that the term “wildlife” should be used as most people understand it as referring to both plants and animals.
- A few participants suggested that the term “components of biological diversity” be used in the target, as this term is used in Article 2 of the Convention. At the local level, where specificity matters, people know what this means for their situation.
- One participant suggested simply the term “species” be used in the target.
- A few participants argued the term “wild species” is not entirely appropriate since most ecosystems contain a mix of undomesticated, semi-domesticated and fully domesticated species. In the Anthropocene no species is truly “wild”. In addition-domesticated species (i.e. new and under-utilized crops) and the genetic diversity of domesticated species that are preserved in traditional farming systems are crucial to human survival in the face of climate change, thus should be included in this target. One participant noted that it is important to look at trade not just in terms of trade with species but trade with products which are being sourced in a biodiversity-friendly way or biodiversity-based products or services such as those related to nature-based tourism.
- One participant believed the focus should not be on commercial trade and harvest, but on local subsistence uses using humane and sustainable practices.

*Forum Question 2. Would it be more effective to monitor trends in illegal trade and harvesting, in addition to trends in legal trade and harvesting?*

- The majority of participants agreed that trends in both illegal and legal trade and harvest should be monitored in the global biodiversity framework, since data on both types of activities are needed in order to properly understand population trends. In addition, the only way to eradicate illegal harvest and trade is to monitor it and then apply proper enforcement strategies.

- However, some participants highlighted how challenging it is to monitor trends in illegal trade and harvesting, and suggested that indicators should not be included if it is unfeasible to measure them.
- Some participants offered solutions to this challenge, such as the use of remote sensing to track illegal logging and harvesting of plants.
- Many participants also highlighted the importance of monitoring population levels and population demographics to understand whether use of a species is sustainable.
- Many participants emphasized the importance of monitoring impacts of harvest and trade on unintended and by-catch species and that indicators to this effect should be included under Target 4.
- One participant noted that collating data not only on legal trade but on seizures and enforcement efforts at a country level is essential for understanding any relationships between legal and illegal wildlife trade.

*Forum Question 3. What indicators could be used in the monitoring framework to ensure the safety of sustainable use?*

- A few participants requested more clarity on the definition of the word “safe” in this target, as the current wording does not make it clear for whom the use needs to be safe. They argued that, for this target, safety should be ensured from an ecological perspective, since it is in the section “Reducing threats to biodiversity” of the framework. Use of biodiversity should be within safe ecological limits and the safety of non-target species should also be ensured.
  - However, one participant argued that both human and animal health and safety should be ensured in this target using the One Health approach.

*Forum Question 4. What techniques currently exist to estimate sustainable harvest, trade or use limits and quotas?*

- A few participants referred to the applicability of the CITES annual export quotas for Target 4, noting their success in ensuring harvest and trade of wild species is legal and sustainable.
- One participant suggested combining CITES-listed species trade data, with other factors (including red list status / population trend) to be used as an indicator.
  - However, other participants questioned the relevance of CITES quotas, since they only apply to the trade of endangered species, and do not cover all forms of sustainable use of biodiversity. These quotas also can encourage overexploitation, since Parties often issue these quotas and they are not always based on sustainability.
- One participant highlighted the BioTrade Principles 1 (conservation) and 2 (sustainable use), which provide specific guidance for sustainable trade. A number of guidelines, manuals and documents as well as related standards (e.g. the Ethical BioTrade standard of the Union for Ethical BioTrade (UEBT)) are supporting stakeholders with the implementation of the BioTrade Principles and Criteria in over 60 countries.
- Some participants also noted that:
  - Quotas should not only be based on trade volumes, but that all other drivers of biodiversity loss should be considered.
  - Science-based adaptive management is needed to ensure sustainable use. As part of sustainability assessments, population trends need to be regularly monitored to ensure

that offtake (legal + illegal) is non-detrimental and there are feedback mechanisms to adjust legal trade levels accordingly.

- Poor enforcement of quotas remains a major problem.
- Integrated fisheries management plans are needed for all fisheries operating within an ecosystem to ensure sustainable use. Ecosystem based approaches are needed.
- Harvest regimes should assume certain levels of illegal harvest when being set, in this way harvesting above sustainable levels can be avoided. Similarly, any data on illegal trade should feed into sustainability assessments for legal trade.

### **Closing Webinar**

#### **Comments from breakout group discussions**

- Addressing the sustainable use of CR, EN, VU species:
  - Participants believed the key is to clearly define what is meant by sustainable use, especially in the context of CR, EN, VU species (what is sustainable may be defined differently for different species).
  - All species should be included in the target, including endangered and vulnerable species. The importance is how the species is managed.
  - With regard to the extractive use of CR, EN, VU species, it is important that any such use be part of incentives to conserve a species. The go-to response should not be to simply exclude extractive use of such species. Where such use can contribute to the conservation of a species, as has been proven for many species in the past, this should be explored. Harvesting levels should be based on sound science and part of a wider management plan. The same is true for trade, especially if revenue generated through the trade can feed into the conservation of the species in question.
- Addressing the legality of use:
  - Sustainability is more important than legality, as what is legal in different countries differs greatly. Therefore, a clear definition of the term legal is needed.
  - Fairness also needs to be added (to Target language) to take into account customary sustainable use of indigenous peoples and local communities.
  - Ethical standards should be part of the global biodiversity framework, considering that local and customary practices are also essential for sustainable use.
  - Reference to IPBES report: there is a link between cultural diversity and biological diversity; at the same time, there need to be common standards, including for the term “sustainability.”
- Addressing how to reference species in the target:
  - The term “resources” is too utilitarian and should be avoided.
  - The term “wild species” should be used instead of “wildlife” and/or “fauna and flora”.
  - Suggestion to use “wild species” (definition of domestic species provided in CBD, so what is not domestic can be considered wild species) but recognizing that wild species are also present in managed ecosystems. It depends on the context in which it is used.
  - Inclusive sustainable use approach would be to use the term “wildlife” since it encompasses several views at the international level. Terminology should be inclusive.



- A way forward would be to use the definition in the text already in the Convention and include fungi.
- Target should address all flora and fauna without exceptions.
- Addressing terms that need clarification or adjustment:
  - The term “safe” needs clarifying (could consult with partners in One Health coalition); want to see “fair” added to target language.
  - The term “offtake” is more appropriate than the term “harvest” in this target, as it covers all uses of biodiversity.
  - Need for clearer definition of terms such as “safe” and “legal”, taking into account customary sustainable use.
  - “Safe” in the context of CBD could be linked to the One Health approach, which includes human, animal and nature health, should also be considered in the global biodiversity framework.
- Addressing unsustainable use:
  - It is important to reduce unsustainable use of biodiversity, the focus should be on reducing unsustainable use and not just increasing sustainable use. There may also be uses that need to be ended.
  - Money, resources, capacity and new techniques to transform unsustainable use into sustainable use are needed. It is more expensive to increase conservation measures (i.e. the surface of protected areas) than to eliminate unsustainable use.
  - Drivers of biodiversity loss should be addressed including on terrestrial and marine ecosystems (reference to Aichi Biodiversity Target 6).
- Addressing the monitoring framework:
  - Both legal and illegal trade need to be monitored in the framework.
  - Trends could look into the proportion of biological resources harvested, traded and used which are most sustainable, through practices which best respect and secure human rights and environmental sustainability in compliance with international law realising fair and equitable access and sharing of benefits in terms of their global impacts as best adapted to regeneration of local biocultural diversity and ecosystems in compliance to ecosystem principles.
- The important drivers of biodiversity loss are overlooked, including timber harvesting.
- Address whether certification could be included in this target.
- Trade needs to be addressed more fully, addressing impacts on biodiversity and potential positive aspects of bio-trade.

### **Ensuring benefits to people through the sustainable use of biodiversity (Target 8)**

**Summary of participants’ inputs:** There was disagreement between participants on whether the focus of this target should be on ensuring sustainable use or ensuring benefits to people. Some participants believed a target ensuring benefits was important, since it gives users an incentive to ensure that the natural world can continue to provide benefits into the future. These participants also recognized the importance of distinguishing between benefits from local use by indigenous peoples and local communities, women and other rights holders that are sustaining their livelihoods and use for national or international commercial markets. Other participants believed the target should be re-worded to shift the focus from providing benefits to ensure that benefits can be provided through sustainable use. Some also argued that, if

sustainable use could be ensured in the post-2020 framework, then nature's benefit for people would, by default, be ensured and a target demanding an increase in benefits might be used as an excuse to intensify and industrialize land use while destroying species and habitats. Some participants suggested that Target 8 should be combined with Target 4, since both targets address the sustainable use of wild species, while others suggested to keep both targets, since they refer to different aspects of wild species, one on reducing threats and one on promoting sustainable use, and both are needed. Regarding the draft monitoring framework, respondents were confused by the monitoring elements of this target, which are focused largely on the sustainable management of fisheries and not on benefits. Some suggested that the IPBES term "nature's contributions to people" should be used, instead of "benefits to people". In addition, respondents indicated that it is unclear whether domesticated species are included in this target, since only wild species are mentioned, but indicators for component 8.2 are related to agriculture. Finally, many respondents pointed out that elements and indicators related to customary sustainable use (CSU) are needed to ensure that the benefits to the most vulnerable are easily accounted for.

### Online Survey

#### Comments frequently raised by respondents of the survey

##### *Target:*

- Some respondents indicated that both Target 4 and Target 8 are closely interrelated, and that this target could be combined with Target 4. In addition, the indicators proposed for Target 8 seem better suited for measuring Target 4 (i.e. many of them measure sustainable harvesting).
- Some respondents argued that this target should aim to ensure sustainable use rather than benefits and that, if sustainable use is ensured, wild species will contribute to nutrition, food security and livelihoods of more people in 2030 and beyond. Respondents also indicated that biodiversity outcomes should be the emphasis of the target, recognizing the benefits to humans and that the target should be action oriented rather than outcome oriented.
  - However, other respondents indicated that Target 8 addresses an important issue and that the equitable sharing of nature's benefits is a fundamental condition for the success of the global biodiversity framework, in particular for balancing the generation of benefits and long-term sustainability.
- Some respondents indicated that the following terms should be defined:
  - Sustainable management
  - Well-being
- Other respondents suggested the following considerations:
  - Consider reframing benefits as current and future benefits from use of wild species of fauna and flora since future benefits will not be achieved if long-term sustainability of biological diversity is compromised.
  - There is no mention of flora in the monitoring elements, which would appear to be an important gap.
- Some respondents also indicated that this target appears to be about "wild species" and that it is confusing as to whether this includes the benefits from food production, and therefore from domesticated species.
  - Others suggested that the target should include domesticated species, local varieties of crops and breeds and their wild relatives, furthermore, other responses suggested that microorganisms (particularly bacteria and fungi) should also be included in addition to flora and fauna, particularly in the medicinal use context.

*Monitoring framework:*

- Some respondents indicated that the components and indicators of Target 8 do not respond to the target wording, as they refer to aquatic or terrestrial wild species, rather than capturing the necessary components of the target under well-being, including food security, nutrition, secure livelihoods and health and that sustainable forest management and other management can also be involved in this target.
- Others indicated that the monitoring element and indicators are only focused on use of species for food and medicine which does not address all the components of the target. It was suggested to include other benefits — such as poverty alleviation, jobs, fragrance, flavours, biopharmaceuticals, cosmetics, fashion, pets, skins, trophy hunting and personal care — and non-material benefits of biodiversity, such as recreation, inspiration, psychological benefits and tourism.
  - However, another respondent argued that it is important to prioritize uses which are essential for human well-being over those which are fundamentally not.
- Some respondents mentioned that a specific component on CSU is crucial in this target and that the benefits for local communities are not included in the indicators. Elements and indicators related to CSU are needed to ensure that the benefits to the most vulnerable are easily accounted for.
- Others indicated that the target indicators should be disaggregated by sex, if possible, as this Target relates to a key gender-biodiversity priority area (equal engagement and leadership).
- SDG indicator 2.3.2: Average income of small-scale food producers, by sex and indigenous status, is not linked directly to the sustainable management of wild species.
- The indicator in row 113 refers to fish, when the monitoring element is about invertebrate stocks, so the indicator should refer to invertebrate animals.

**Other comments raised by respondents of the survey**

- Some respondents highlighted the importance of considering that what constitutes a “sustainable” off-take today might not be sustainable or might be too small for human livelihoods in the future.
- Others commented that the “degree of implementation” and “degree of application” seem somewhat arbitrary in terms of indicators and that reporting against these is often subjective.
- Respondents also indicated that the Red List Index is often not adequate for use in data-poor countries, such as small island developing States.
- Others also indicated that trends in bycatch databases could also be considered, along with a number of Parties implementing the FAO International Guidelines on Bycatch Management and Reduction of Discards (consider other possible synergies with FAO in this target).

**Online Discussion Forum**

The following questions were posted to the online discussion forum under the thread Ensuring Benefits to People through Sustainable Use:

*Forum Question 1. Why is it important for the post-2020 global biodiversity framework to ensure nature's benefits to people and not just sustainable use?*

- A majority of participants agreed that it is important for the global biodiversity framework to ensure nature's benefits to people. Ensuring benefits gives users an incentive to ensure that the natural world can continue to provide benefits into the future.
  - However, other participants believed the target should shift focus from providing benefits to ensure that benefits can be provided. Some argued that, if the post-2020 framework can

ensure use is sustainable, then, by default, it would be ensuring nature's benefit for people and that a target demanding an increase in benefits might be used as an excuse to intensify and industrialize land use while destroying species and habitats. Economic or social benefits from use will be accompanying effects but should not be the main objective.

- Some participants believed the focus of this target should be on whether or not the use benefits local community livelihoods and well-being, while also ensuring that it is biologically sustainable and does not harm human or animal health.
  - However other participants disagreed. Limiting the consideration of benefits to indigenous people and communities would not be realistic and would undermine biodiversity conservation.
  - However, these participants still recognized the importance of distinguishing between local use by indigenous peoples and local communities, women and other rights holders that are sustaining their livelihoods and use, harvest and trade for national or international commercial markets.
- Many participants agreed that the global biodiversity framework should use the IPBES term “nature's contributions to people” instead of “benefits to people”.
- One participant commented that ensuring benefits is a question of economic fairness and equity: as long as it remains more profitable to destroy biodiversity than it is to use it sustainably (i.e. in a way that increases it) biodiversity will continue to decline. To reverse this trend, it is essential to find a way to make sure everyone who benefits from biodiversity is obliged to fairly and equitably share enough of that benefit to ensure sustainable use and conservation.
- One person noted that, in order to enhance biodiversity conservation and maintain ecosystem integrity while ensuring fair and equitable distribution of benefits from the system, there need to be trade-offs to minimize conflicts and negative impacts on nature and society. The SDGs show the interconnectedness between the users of nature and economic and social benefits, and also provide a framework for addressing the trade-offs.

*Forum Question 2. Are there benefits to people, other than food and medicine, that the post-2020 global biodiversity framework should monitor in Target 8?*

- The following benefits to be monitored under Target 8 were suggested:
  - **Material:**

▪ Textiles	▪ Wax
▪ leather	▪ Resins
▪ Jewellery	▪ Furs
▪ Timber	▪ Pets
▪ Fibre	▪ Trophies
▪ Shelter	▪ Medicines
  - **Non-material:**

▪ Recreation and tourism
▪ Spiritual and cultural connection
▪ Cultural benefits
▪ Health
  - **Regulating:**

▪ Clean water
▪ Clean air
▪ Disaster risk reduction
▪ Climate regulation

- One participant highlighted the fact that the draft monitoring framework does not include monitoring elements on benefits. These can currently only be found in the indicators for goal B.

*Forum Question 3. One of the aims of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework is to ensure the sustainable use of biological diversity; should it monitor activities that ensure benefits to people through sustainable use?*

- A few participants believed it would be useful to monitor and identify trends in activities that provide benefits to people and enhance the livelihoods of indigenous peoples and local communities through sustainable use of wild species.
  - However, one participant warned that it is difficult to measure sustainability of use using quantitative data. Any attempts at monitoring should avoid imposing global or outside standards on use in specific cultural contexts.
- One participant suggested that monitoring can take advantage of programmes incorporating sustainable use, such as Globally Important Agricultural Heritage Systems (GIAHS), Man and the Biosphere (MAB), emerging work on OECMs, and others.

### **Closing Webinar**

#### **Comments from breakout group discussions**

- Addressing the importance of sustainable use vs. benefits:
  - There was agreement that the focus should be on sustainability in order to ensure benefits (rather than just ensuring benefits). If use is not sustainable then benefits will not be ensured over the long term. Therefore, the target should be re-worded as follows: “Ensure that use is sustainable, thereby ensuring benefits, including...”
  - If biodiversity is being used, it is because people are benefiting from it. The focus should be on ensuring the use is sustainable. The use should benefit people and nature at the same time.
  - Important to point out that sustainability includes environmental, social and economic aspects, so the emphasis on nature’s contributions to people needs to be maintained. There should be a mechanism to ensure that benefits (monetary and non-monetary, such as technology, knowledge) arising from sustainable use of biodiversity flow back to the stewards of biodiversity—organizations and communities at the local level.
  - Monitoring benefits may be outside the scope of the Convention on Biological Diversity.
  - It is important the global biodiversity framework ensures nature’s benefits to people.
- Addressing benefits for the vulnerable:
  - The framework should have a stronger focus on benefits to the most vulnerable (this needs to be better reflected in indicators and monitoring framework).
  - There is a need for making a distinction between different biodiversity user groups. Women and indigenous peoples and local communities have different uses and depend on biodiversity for their survival, it is essential that this distinction is made in the framework.
  - Elements and indicators related to customary sustainable use are needed to ensure that the benefits to the most vulnerable are easily accounted for.
  - T8 should include intergenerational justice.

- Addressing the overlap between Targets 4 and 8:
  - There seems to be an overlap between Targets 4 and 8; a suggestion would be to either merge them or to address very specific aspects in each to avoid the consistent overlap.
  - Suggestion to keep both T4 and T8 as they refer to different aspects of wild species, one on reducing threats and one on promoting sustainable use, both are needed.
- More attention needs to be placed in the monitoring framework, especially on indicators.
- It was suggested to use the term “ecosystem services” rather than “benefits”.
- A component is needed with a focus on pathogen-sharing and the need for facilitated access.
- The framework could recognize that one of the possible forms of sustainable use is through the promotion of a bioeconomy, since it has the potential to modernize traditional economic sectors through research, development and innovation activities, without compromising environmental integrity, based on economic, environmental and societal returns.
- The global biodiversity framework should also take into account sustainable food production, including domesticated animals.

#### **Sustainable use of biodiversity in managed ecosystems (Target 9)**

**Summary of participants’ inputs:** The majority of respondents found the reference to “reducing productivity gaps” confusing. Many indicated it was unclear which productivity gap was being referred to. In addition, it seemed unclear how this gap could be reduced in all managed ecosystems and not just agricultural systems. Some respondents suggested deleting this aspect of the target; others suggested the target should be re-worded to emphasize that increases in productivity need to be done in sustainable ways that help maintain ecosystem functions (e.g. as per SDG2.4). Some respondents believed that the focus should be on the sustainable management of agroecosystems rather than on increasing their productivity, since increases in productivity can potentially harm biodiversity. Respondents also asked for more clarity on which managed ecosystems are covered by this target. Many respondents also pointed out that the monitoring framework should include indicators for all forms of biodiversity-friendly agriculture, not just conservation agriculture. Finally, many respondents pointed out the importance of the use of landscape or ecosystem approaches in managed ecosystems (i.e. by meeting minimum thresholds of natural habitat), since biodiverse working landscapes play an important role in providing landscape connectivity and protecting species.

#### **Online survey**

##### **Comments frequently raised by respondents of the survey**

###### *Target:*

- Many respondents indicated that the current reference to “reducing productivity gaps” is unclear and there are no indicators to measure its progress. They also indicated that the main objective of the target should be that use of biological diversity is sustainable, and that it contributes to resilient ecosystems in the landscape, rather than focusing on productivity, which is not one of the objectives of the Convention.
- Some respondents also mentioned that clarification is needed regarding what managed ecosystems are included in this target (for example whether mining areas and rangelands are included) and indicated that forest ecosystems and aquaculture should be explicitly mentioned.
- Some respondents pointed out that this target does not mention the role of biodiverse agricultural landscapes in providing habitat for species or for improving landscape connectivity and that it is important to recognize the role of biodiverse agricultural landscape in species protection, as well

as for the benefits they provide to people. Ecosystem restoration, ecosystem-based approaches and landscape approaches should be included in this target.

- However, another respondent argued that spatial planning should not be the focus of the target, since T1 deals with this issue.
- Others also suggested that food waste and loss should be addressed in this Target.

*Monitoring framework:*

- Some respondents indicated that the following indicator “Areas of agricultural land under conservation agriculture” is narrow and lacks clarity and that all forms of biodiversity friendly agriculture should be considered, including climate smart, organic, agroecological practices and agroforestry.
- Others indicated that SDG indicators 2.3, 2.4 and 2.5 are highly relevant for CSU and data generated for relevant indicators under this target need to be disaggregated for indigenous peoples and local communities and monitored through community-based monitoring and information systems. In this regard, some suggested adding an indicator for land tenure security and access to wild species of fauna and flora for customary and sustainable use.
- In addition to the two certification schemes mentioned in the indicator on area of forest under sustainable management, some respondents noted that there are national schemes which should be included and that indicators should also consider certification schemes beyond forest certification, such as certification and traceability schemes now being used for marine fisheries resources and harvest of medicinal plants (measuring for example the progress with the implementation of the FairWild Standard and certification framework).
  - However, others indicated that sole reliance on third party sustainable forest management certification would likely exclude measurement of significant areas of reserves and production forests that are being sustainably managed but are not certified.
- Respondents indicated that measures relevant to safety and the consideration of zoonotic diseases and their connection to destruction of habitat and proximity of human activities, including livestock, to natural areas and wild species of animals, are also missing.

**Other comments raised by respondents of the survey**

- Others suggested that the target should consider the development of sustainable urban agriculture, which not only boosts biodiversity but tackles ‘food deserts’ and reduces food transport.
- Some respondents also indicated that Target 9 should ensure that women are given equal rights to economic resources, and access to ownership and control over land and other property, financial services, and natural resources in accordance with national and customary law. Target indicators must also be disaggregated by sex when possible.
- A suggestion was made for an element of this target to focus on eliminating perverse incentives for increasing agricultural industrialization (particularly livestock).

**Closing Webinar**

**Comments from breakout group discussions**

- Addressing the goal to reduce productivity gaps:
  - Clarification is needed on the concept of “Productivity gap” and on indicators regarding sustainable agriculture (i.e. what gap is being referred to?). Participants suggested either



deleting or replacing it as it seems to focus prevalently on agriculture, and it would work differently in other managed ecosystems.

- It is important to ensure improved habitat conservation together with sustainable use/productivity.
- Stressing sustainability vs. productivity – agriculture needs to be sustainable in long term for both biodiversity and people (productive enough to sustain livelihoods long term and sustain biodiversity long term).
- The target could promote increasing productivity on a restricted amount of land using new technologies.
- Transitions to biodiversity-friendly agriculture are needed.
- Focus should be around enhancing productivity rather than production increases (if we can increase productivity, we can produce more food with less land, hence spare other ecosystems). Productivity is an important aspect, but this increase in productivity needs to be in ways that help maintain ecosystems (for example see SDG2.4: “resilient agricultural practices that increase productivity and production, that help maintain ecosystems, that strengthen capacity for adaptation to climate change, extreme weather, drought, flooding and other disasters and that progressively improve land and soil quality”).
- Enhancing productivity is often linked to the use of unsustainable methods, however enhancing productivity may also allow more natural habitat to be conserved.
- Productivity is a term that needs further discussion, including going beyond an economical approach, access to food in contrast to food production, drivers of loss of biodiversity.
- Addressing the managed ecosystems that need to be included in this target:
  - There is an assumption that food comes only from agriculture, but food can also come from wild ecosystems, especially from the marine ecosystem. In that sense, there was a suggestion to add that element to T9. Also, there was a suggestion that productivity gap should not be used.
  - T8/T9 are missing specific actions, allowing for different sectors to engage effectively (for example, what practices are sustainable in each sector; what actions are needed; how does this apply to such sectors as infrastructure, etc.).
  - More specific actions could be articulated in the target, elements, or as indicators for each sector. A general target that mentions the productive sectors is not going to be enough to engage them or to make them accountable — if use is sustainable, it must benefit both biodiversity and ensure benefits to people for potential indicators on sustainability in specific sectors (agriculture, etc.).
  - There is a need to look at different levels of managed ecosystems, looking at the whole spectrum of management and in terms of benefits to people and sustainability; for example, a national park is a managed ecosystem, as is a farm.
  - The focus should be on the sustainable management of agroecosystems and other managed ecosystems such as forestry and fisheries.
  - The dichotomy in the framework between natural environments and managed environments is problematic. The aim should be to ensure that biodiversity can thrive in all environments and to create a better relationship with nature across all environments.

- Managed environments are not just agriculture, they could also be urban or other managed ecosystems (so a broadening of T9 could be desirable).
- More clarity is needed on which managed ecosystems are covered by this target.
- Including legal and illegal uses, impacts on target and non-target species, impacts on human health, etc.
- Addressing the need for an ecosystem-based approach:
  - The target cannot just refer to one species in managed ecosystems, an ecosystem approach could help ensure that use is not harming all species in the ecosystem. The whole ecosystem needs to be considered, not just the species being harvested. All elements of an ecosystem are interacting.
  - Ecosystem approach and/or landscape approaches are useful for all use to be sustainable.
  - The target could aim to meet minimum thresholds of natural habitat within managed ecosystems (e.g. guidance for 10% or 20%) down to small scales (e.g. per km<sup>2</sup>).
  - Using landscape approaches in agroecosystems would be beneficial, since biodiverse agricultural landscapes play an important role in providing landscape connectivity and protecting species.
- CSU should be taken more into account in this target as small holders and indigenous peoples and local communities play an important role.
- Areas of conservation agriculture: this is a good indicator because it is easy to measure and should be kept in the framework.
- Clear certification mechanisms are needed, for the consumer to be aware that the product of the managed ecosystem is sustainable. CBD could collaborate with other organizations (e.g. International Organization for Standardization, ISO) in this regard.
- There should be a target specifically addressing the reduction of food waste and food loss.
- In the CBD report “Synthesizing the scientific evidence to inform the development of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework” of May 2020 ([CBD/SBSTTA/24/INF/9](#)), there are examples of how to approach productivity that could be useful in the drafting of the framework. For example, in relation to land degradation “there is need to develop conservation agriculture, contour line ploughing, no tillage or sowing directly into a cover crop and mulching bare surfaces in order to decrease soil erosion by over 80%. Crop diversification can also improve soil fertility and water-holding capacity.”
- The transformation of food systems toward sustainable food production is an important element of the global biodiversity framework.
- Climate change puts additional stress on CSU. Food production should take this into account.
- Regenerative management of managed ecosystems is needed.

### **Mainstreaming and sustainable use across sectors (Target 13)**

**Summary of participants’ inputs:** Many participants indicated that more integration of sustainable use across sectors is needed in the framework. Participants found that there is especially a need to increase awareness and accountability of businesses across sectors, through sector-specific guidance and mainstreaming. Some participants agreed that to engage different sectors, a more detailed framework establishing a second layer of SMART components with sector specific indicators is needed. They also felt that the target should reference non-government actors, including the private sector. A few participants suggested that corporate natural capital accounting should be mainstreamed across all sectors, making

explicit the contributions of nature in a company's products and income. Participants also felt there is a need to establish mechanisms to promote dialogue and collaboration between actors and it is key to have a harmonization of policy goals across critical sectors that influence natural resource governance. A few participants also requested a clearer definition of the term 'biodiversity values' and suggested alternative language. Finally, participants suggested adding specific indicators to help implement and track the contribution of mainstreaming sustainable use both as a process and as an output.

### Online Survey

#### Comments frequently raised by respondents of the survey

##### *Target:*

- Some respondents suggested that the target should not only focus on “mainstreaming *biodiversity values*” but should rather focus on “mainstreaming *values of biodiversity and ecosystem services*” or simply “mainstreaming *biodiversity*”.
- Some respondents also indicated that spatial planning could be included in Target 13 rather than in Target 1 and that focus on “integrated landscape and seascape management” should be added.
- Other respondents mentioned that the target needs more reference to non-government actors, notably the private sector and that more integration of sustainable use across sectors is needed, including mainstreaming and monitoring through appropriate reporting and regulation measures. Some indicated that “Mainstreaming across all sectors” should promote coordination across sectors and levels of governance and highlighted the importance of establishing mechanisms to promote dialogue and collaboration between actors to have a harmonization of policy goals across critical sectors that influence natural resources governance.
- Some responses focused on the need to increase awareness and accountability of businesses across sectors, through sector-specific guidance and mainstreaming. Some options to increase accountability among sectors were mentioned, including through economic valuations of ecosystems. Others indicated that the Communication, Education and Public Awareness (CEPA) tool kit and training would help in reaching out to various target groups and thereby more effectively mainstream biodiversity and ecosystem services across sectors.
- Some respondents indicated that there is a need to evaluate the impact and efficiency of the fiscal incentives associated with the management of biodiversity and reform the incentives that are ineffective, inefficient and/or contradictory.
- Others indicated the need to reduce the impacts associated with activities in productive sectors and throughout the entire value chain of products and services that directly and indirectly generate anthropic risks for ecosystems.
- Others suggested including and recognizing the links between biological and cultural diversity in this Target.

##### *Monitoring framework:*

- If “biodiversity values” are to be used, some respondents suggested using the existing System of Environmental-Economic Accounting Experimental Ecosystem Accounting (SEEA EEA).
- Suggestions were made for this target to also include monitoring indicators on payment for ecosystem services and to develop guidelines on how to implement payment for ecosystem services.

- Some respondents indicated that the monitoring elements do not currently include mainstreaming into use-related policies, such as agriculture and other production activities and that these need to be specifically mentioned, in order to mainstream sustainable use throughout the framework.
- Some highlighted that the indicators against the monitoring elements on “Trends in integration of biodiversity and ecosystem service values into planning processes (lines 152 and 153), refer to countries taking specific actions, but does not bring into play the role of subnational governments and communities in similar actions.
- Others also mentioned that it is important to have indicators that describe actions that lead to sustainable use and that specific indicators that will help track the contribution of mainstreaming sustainable use both as a process and as an output should be defined.
- Others also suggested that the monitoring components could make more reference to the uptake of specific tools that reflect mainstreaming, including number of countries employing systems of environmental accounts, number of countries utilising environmental fiscal reform, number of countries with biodiversity criteria in departmental budget proposals, etc.

#### **Other comments raised by respondents of the survey**

- Others indicated that biodiversity could have diverse “values”, both monetary and non-monetary, and these differing concepts should be reflected in the Target.
- Some respondents also indicated that governments could provide more clarity about the use of non-financial disclosure for biodiversity.
- The need for greater recognition of the benefits from non-consumptive uses of wildlife on sustainable development, and of conservation in particular through the long-term impact of changing attitudes towards animals and natural habitats was also highlighted as important for this target.

#### **Online Discussion Forum**

The following questions were posted to the online discussion forum under the thread Sustainable Use of Biological Diversity Across Sectors:

*Forum Question 1. How can un/sustainable consumption and production be measured to ensure the sustainable use of biodiversity across sectors? What would be the implications for the monitoring framework of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework?*

- Many participants highlighted the existence of several labelling and certification systems already in place (e.g. MSC or PFC/FSC) that have proven to be effective to ensure sustainable harvesting and production of wild living resources.
  - However, other participants expressed concerns over relying solely on third party certification schemes since they are often inaccessible to many resource users for several reasons.
- Some participants agreed that a common definition of sustainable consumption, production practices and supply chains is needed.
- Many participants also agreed that the monitoring framework needs to establish what is unsustainable or when ecological limits are reached or surpassed.
  - One participant recommended the ecological footprint as a good starting point that could be applied at multiple governance levels.
- Many participants expressed that productive sectors should be asked to report their ecological footprint and show to what extent their sustainability strategies contribute to the decrease of negative impacts on biodiversity.

- A few participants highlighted the importance of integrating traditional knowledge when measuring sustainable consumption and production trends.
- A few participants commented that NGOs play a lead role in integrating and mainstreaming knowledge and information on sustainable use.
- The following reports and monitoring frameworks were suggested by participants to be considered by the global biodiversity framework:
  - For forest management, information is captured in the five-year FAO Global Forest Resources Assessment, but to undertake this reporting many countries subscribe to specific criteria and indicator frameworks, such as Forests Europe, Montreal Process, and the ITTO framework.
  - Assessment of the overseas environmental footprint of the largest consuming nations can be found in the WWF UK/RSPB reports “Risky Business (2017)” and “Riskier Business (2020)”.

*Forum Question 2. How can the monitoring framework of the global biodiversity framework better integrate productive sectors to ensure and promote the sustainable use of biological diversity? What would the implications be for the monitoring framework of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework?*

- Many participants agreed that a more detailed framework establishing a second layer of SMART components for each sector is needed, with specific indicators, sector by sector. Monitoring elements should develop transformative change to ensure sustainable production and consumption. Otherwise, the framework will be too general, not helping to give clear guidance to each sector to achieve biodiversity sustainability, making the engagement of the private sector more difficult.
- A few participants suggested that corporate natural capital accounting should be mainstreamed across all sectors, making explicit the contributions of nature in a company’s products and income.
  - An example of this is in a recent report from the World Economic Forum which suggests that half of the world’s GDP is moderately or highly dependent on nature. The analysis is broken down by 163 industry sectors and their supply chains, showing that it is possible to disaggregate this data between different productive sectors.
  - One participant indicated that sustainable consumption and production of nature and biodiversity can only be measured through a framework that sets agreed values for environmental assets with and without market prices and a methodology for how ‘natural capital costs’ are transferred along value chains along with an explicit incorporation of those into companies’ accounting.

*Forum Question 3. How can the framework monitor progress of “ensuring people everywhere understand and appreciate the value of biodiversity”, taking into account “individual and national cultural and socioeconomic conditions”?*

- One participant suggested the different efforts made by governments, regions, municipalities, companies, and all educational organizations, (labelling efforts, information campaigns etc.) in ensuring the development of an increase in understanding and appreciation of biodiversity should be monitored.
- One participant suggested the actual appreciation and valuation of biodiversity by people should be monitored.
  - An example of this type of valuation is in the [World Values Survey](#).

- Surveys regarding consumers preferences and understanding of biodiversity is a way to measure progress on this issue.
- A few participants pointed out that bottom up, community driven approaches to biodiversity valuation are needed, not just top-down approaches.

### **Closing Webinar**

#### **Comments from breakout group discussions**

- Addressing the role of governments:
  - Target needs to be more specific with the wording; it needs to allow for the fact that environment ministries will need to bring the framework/targets to push this with other relevant ministries and sectors.
  - Consumer awareness is important, but there is a significant role for government policies on trading and importing, legislation and regulation and policy to ensure sustainable consumption.
- Addressing the role of non-government actors:
  - The target should reference the role of non-government actors, including the private sector.
  - Need to increase awareness and accountability of businesses across sectors (e.g. sector-specific guidance and mainstreaming).
  - A specific target looking at the financial sector is needed to ensure that the lending of financial bodies is compliant with the biodiversity aspirations of the new targets. All major lending should be filtered, so the onus is on the financial body to ensure it is not negatively impacting biodiversity. A regulatory mechanism in place to monitor positive biodiversity outcomes is needed. The financial sector should explicitly identify the biodiversity-related risks of their investments.
  - The target needs to speak beyond governments – especially it needs to address productive sectors, civil society, the private sector, etc., need to determine how the post-2020 framework can be structured to engage all stakeholders.
  - All actors have to be involved, not all the burden should be on indigenous peoples and local communities. Halting biodiversity loss can be promoted by mainstreaming throughout society and different sectors.
- Mainstreaming should be seen as reciprocal arrangement (what sectors need to do for biodiversity, but also what biodiversity can do for those sectors).
- Clarify definition of mainstreaming, including appropriate indicators.
- Indicators to reflect mainstreaming can include ensuring biodiversity-inclusive policies/processes are in place, but these need to be coupled with outcome indicators in sustainable consumption targets (e.g. ecological footprint indicators, etc.).
- More integration of sustainable use across sectors is needed, including mainstreaming and monitoring through appropriate reporting and regulation measures.

### **Sustainable consumption and production (Target 15)**

**Summary of participants' inputs:** Many participants were of the opinion that Target 15 was vague and lacked precision, particularly with regard to the “elimination of unsustainable consumption patterns”. Some participants believed the language “taking into account individual and national cultural and socioeconomic circumstances” seemed more suited for the preambular paragraphs relating to the framework as a whole

than just specifically to this target. However, other respondents argued that consumption patterns are a function of country development and must be treated differently across geographies to be fair. Some respondents also believed that the language “ensuring people everywhere understand and appreciate the value of biodiversity” is an outcome of the purpose of mainstreaming and is therefore duplicative of Target 13. Many participants highlighted the existence of labelling and certification systems already in place (e.g. MSC or PFC/FSC) that have proven to be effective to ensure sustainable harvesting and production of wild living resources. However, other participants expressed concerns over relying solely on third party certification schemes, since they are often inaccessible to many resource users for several reasons. Participants agreed that the monitoring framework needs to establish criteria for consumption and production that is deemed unsustainable or when ecological limits are reached or surpassed. Some participants felt there should be a target or component specifically addressing the reduction of food waste and food loss. Finally, many respondents believed the target should promote change in consumption patterns and supply chains and should include circular economy principles.

### **Online Survey**

#### **Comments frequently raised by respondents of the survey**

##### *Target:*

- Several respondents thought that Target 15 was too vague and lacks precision, particularly with regard to the “elimination of unsustainable consumption patterns” and questioned how this can be reduced to “zero” and how this can be measured. Furthermore, respondents indicated that the elimination of these patterns should also be linked specifically to biodiversity and not simply the loss of biodiversity (as the target suggests).
- Some respondents indicated that the target as currently proposed is not SMART, too broad in scope and unclear on how these aspirations could be achieved and reported on. A suggestion was made to break the target up into two: e.g. (i) eliminating consumption pattern; and (ii) understanding and appreciating biodiversity.
- Some respondents also mentioned that all the targets should take into account individual and national cultural and socioeconomic circumstances and that this language could be more suited in preambular paragraphs relating to the framework as a whole rather than just specifically to this target.
  - However, others indicated that consumption patterns are a function of country development and must be treated differently across geographies in order to be fair.
- Some respondents suggested including principles related to circular economy in this target.
- Others indicated that “Ensuring people everywhere understand and appreciate the value of biodiversity” is an outcome of the purpose of mainstreaming and is therefore duplicative of Target 13. They also indicated that referencing the 2050 Vision is redundant in the target.
- Some respondents also highlighted the links between this target and SDG 12, particularly targets 12.1 and 12.8.
- Similar to Target 13, some respondents highlighted the need to identify sector-specific changes.
- Other respondents indicated that it is important to promote change in consumption patterns as well as in production and related supply chains and that it is essential to include production into Target 15.
- Some indicated that Target 15 shifts the responsibility to the consumer and that it should be complimented by a target that shifts the responsibility to governments to create an enabling

environment, both legal as well as financially for the private sector to offer a wide range of affordable biodiversity-friendly products.

*Monitoring framework:*

- Some respondents suggested further developing the concept of ecological footprint as an indicator.
- Other responses indicated that eco-labelling mechanisms could be included in the indicators for this target and that indicators could address specific sectors.
- Others suggested that the target could include specific elements relating to the reduction of demand for and consumption of wild meat, with a particular emphasis on urban settings, and on encouraging initiatives that deliver alternative sources of protein to subsistence consumers of wild animals, in order to further reduce the risk to human health and wildlife populations.

**Other comments raised by respondents of the survey**

- A suggestion was made to consider the contribution of wild species to sustainable/responsible consumption practices, and the reduction in consumption and demand for illegally traded wildlife products as part of undertaking measurable steps towards sustainable consumption lifestyles.
- A suggestion was made for this target to be grounded within robust and regularly monitored data, such as the World Bank's "Global Consumption Database", with complementary useful reference points in the United Nations Environment Programme's review of the Sustainable Development Goal 12 on sustainable consumption and production patterns.

**Closing Webinar**

**Comments from breakout group discussions**

- The most important action to be taken is to phase out and redirect perverse incentives and investments that contribute to unsustainable use in different sectors.
- Circular economy principles need to be included in this target.
- The target of eliminating unsustainable consumption is not achievable within the next ten years so the framework should have a behavioural change approach to achieve and reduce consumption. This should also be balanced with options for responsible choices for consumers from genuine sustainable production.
- A bridge could be built within the text that can help communication between consumer countries and producer countries during the negotiations.
- Need clearer linkages between sustainable use, sustainable consumption, and sustainable production.
- Limits for use need to be defined/co-developed with the relevant actors.
- Sustainable use focuses on goods and services from nature (Goal A, being conserved) that support people (Goal B), thus on direct transactions and societal values (Goal C, benefits and sharing).
- Drivers of change need to be incorporated as part of the solution, this can be done, for example, by reducing erosion in agricultural landscapes and promoting restoration.
- Addressing unsustainable consumption is critical but needs to be phrased so as to encourage people: use responsible consumption.



### **Customary sustainable use**

**Summary of participants' inputs:** Some participants indicated that customary sustainable use (CSU) needs to be strengthened in the current draft of the framework. Others indicated that respecting, protecting, securing and promoting customary land tenure and the practice of traditional knowledge needs to be part of the framework. Some participants highlighted that the framework needs to address the connection between loss of indigenous land and loss of biodiversity. The important role that traditional knowledge and CSU play in in situ biodiversity conservation and sustainable use (as in Articles 8(j) and 10(c)) of the Convention) should be recognized in the framework, but it is currently undervalued, underrecognized and underreported. Others also suggested that CSU is a cross-cutting theme and needs to be integrated into the targets, monitoring elements and indicators of the global biodiversity framework in order to achieve its biodiversity goals. Others highlighted the importance of integrating CSU into national biodiversity strategies and action plans (NBSAPs) and national reports, with the full support and participation of indigenous peoples and local communities. Other participants indicated that it is important to provide incentives and build long-term partnerships with custodians of biodiversity. Some participants suggested that initiatives regarding indigenous peoples and local communities that ensure the sustainable use of biodiversity need to be encouraged and financed and traditional knowledge needs to be integrated across development sectors. Others proposed that community-based monitoring and information systems and other initiatives of indigenous peoples and local communities, such as the *Local Biodiversity Outlooks*, should be strengthened by increasing the capacity of indigenous communities to collect, manage and have access to biodiversity data. Participants provided many examples of indigenous peoples and local communities that depend on and safeguard biodiversity in their countries and existing programmes and laws that support them.

### **Online survey**

#### **Comments on how CSU can be better integrated into the global biodiversity framework**

- Some respondents suggested that the framework needs to address the connection between loss of indigenous land and loss of biodiversity and that respecting, protecting, securing and promoting customary land tenure and the practice of traditional knowledge needs to be a priority for the framework.
- Another suggestion by some respondents was to integrate CSU across the targets, monitoring elements and indicators of the framework as this will be crucial to achieving its biodiversity goals. It was also suggested to integrate protection of indigenous territories, rights and traditional knowledge and self-determination across the framework.
  - However, other respondents indicated that assuming that subsistence, traditional or customary uses automatically being considered as “sustainable” should be avoided and that the framework should instead look to develop clear measures of biological and ecological sustainability and seek to help cultural and social “norms” adapt according to biologically sustainability criteria.
- Some respondents also suggested adding a reference to indigenous and local knowledge, with rigorous adherence to principles of free, prior and informed consent to indicators where possible. It was noted that, while this is the function of Target 20, repetition of monitoring elements and indicators is common throughout the framework and serves as a means of establishing linkages between targets.
- Others mentioned that CSU also needs to be integrated into NBSAPs and NRs, with the full support and participation of indigenous peoples and local communities.
- Some respondents also indicated that initiatives by indigenous peoples and local communities that ensure the sustainable use of biodiversity need to be encouraged and financed and traditional knowledge needs to be integrated across development sectors, and that cultural values and

traditional knowledge should also be mainstreamed in all policies, processes and education systems.

- Some respondents indicated that collaborative partnerships involving indigenous, local or traditional communities should be developed and that transformative partnerships are necessary to support adaptation to the effects of biodiversity loss and to build resilient societies.
- Various respondents indicated that engagement and capacity-building are needed in communities, in this regard, participants to the survey suggested various actions around the following:
  - Training in value addition of raw forest bioresources so that the value of such secondary products can fetch good returns to forest-dwelling people.
  - Increasing capacity of indigenous communities to collect, manage and have access to biodiversity data and the ability to observe and manage variations in vegetation and precipitation, temporally and spatially, in order to maintain sustainable livelihoods and economic growth.
  - Empowering communities to engage in sustainable practices, by consultation and through the issuing of special permits based on monitoring of resources. Captive breeding, sustainable silviculture and sustainable agriculture may also support local and traditional communities while reducing the impacts on natural ecosystems. This information should be shared in local languages with the local organizations and communities for bettering their livelihoods.
- Others indicated that funding must be directed to the task of researching CSU and supporting the maintenance of CSU practices.
- Some respondents to the survey suggested that the monitoring framework, including the indicators should consider how customary sustainable use equally benefits women and men and promotes participation of indigenous peoples and local communities. The use of community-based monitoring and information systems was also suggested for as many indicators as possible.
- Some respondents believed the framework could put more emphasis on the implementation of the Nagoya Protocol.
- Other respondents indicated that there needs to be more recognition of the methods and conservation outcomes of Indigenous and Community Conserved Areas (ICCAs) and OECMs managed by indigenous peoples and local communities. Importantly, the establishment of PAs need to involve indigenous peoples and local communities and respect their rights, and effective OECMs need to be counted towards any percentage target for protected areas.
- Furthermore, some respondents highlighted the need to include indigenous peoples and local communities more actively in the design of the framework and in identifying the goals, targets, and indicators

#### **Specific target and indicator recommendations with regard to CSU**

- T2 should explicitly protect self-governed territories of indigenous peoples and local communities as effective area-based conservation measures that respect all rights.
- For T19.4, add an indicator on trends in land tenure security and access to terrestrial, freshwater, and marine flora and fauna for customary and sustainable use.
- Customary sustainable use could potentially be added to the components, monitoring elements and indicators associated with Target 4, which aims to ensure that the harvesting, trade and use of wild species of fauna and flora, is legal, at sustainable levels and safe.

- For T20: An important component of this target is education of officials at different levels and for research, in collaboration with indigenous peoples and local communities to continue to develop methods and approaches, particularly around planning and development processes. Respondents indicated that this should be done in relation to different country contexts and the challenges that different representatives of indigenous peoples and local communities and officials have.
  - An indicator could be related to the degree of education being conducted for officials at different levels.

**Some examples of CSU implemented as a strategy in conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity**

- In the Kanuri community, ancestors used to associate bad luck to the hunting of some animals by one family more than once in a year or prohibited members of the community from entirely cutting down some special species of trees such as the “Baobab” trees in the forest.
- CSU management strategies (usually referred to as traditional management) are recommended in the 2014 FAO Voluntary Guidelines for Securing Sustainable Small-Scale Fisheries in the Context of Food Security and Poverty Eradication (SSF Guidelines).
- In Guatemala, indigenous peoples manage the ecosystems based on their practices and customary law, see examples on this webpage <https://sotzil-guatemaya.org/mapa/>
- Several outstanding cases in which livelihoods are heavily dependent on biodiversity, include examples such as Bighorn Sheep hunting and trophy trade in Mexico, Saltwater Crocodile harvest and trade in Australia or Ibex and Markhor trophy hunting in Tajikistan. These examples document how CSU has been implemented in some countries both through policies as well as projects.
- At the level of national policies, CSU has been written into the constitutions such as those of Namibia and Zimbabwe which explicitly recognize the right to use wildlife resources sustainably.
- The Government of India enacted the “Forest Rights Act-2006” empowering tribal people and forest dwellers to own and manage land.
- In India, preservation of sacred groves by women is another example of traditional forest management. Preservation of sacred groves have helped to preserve landscape biodiversity and maintain ecological services, preventing soil erosion, ensuring extensive water holding capacity especially the ground water.
- In Togo, the existence of sacred forests or the totem poles of certain local peoples who do not eat certain animals allow the sustainable use of biodiversity.
- The multifunctional agrosilvopastoral system known as “montado” in Portugal (and “dehesa” in Spain) is typical of the Iberian Peninsula. This agroforestry system is crucial to combat desertification and to support the populations of Iberian lynx (*Lynx pardinus*).
- In accordance with its obligations under the Treaty of Waitangi, the New Zealand Government utilises distinct processes and institutions that afford opportunities for Māori involvement in decision-making processes that affect their rights and interests. These range from broad assurances of participation in decision-making through to particular instances in which certain legal requirements must be fulfilled.
- Joint management arrangements with indigenous peoples and local communities, such as the Australian Indigenous Protected Areas programme, deliver broad ranging benefits which extend well beyond biodiversity outcomes. Managing Indigenous Protected Areas helps Indigenous communities to protect their significant cultural values for future generations while simultaneously generating health, education, economic and social benefits.

- In the highlands in the interior of Borneo (Indonesia and Malaysia), IPs (Dayak Lundayeh/Lun Bawan/Kelabit) have practiced traditional agriculture (wet rice fields) for centuries, based on sound ecological and traditional knowledge, the integrated cycle of water buffalo husbandry, raising ducks, high agrobiodiversity, and preservation of the water sources for irrigation. The system has respected the fragile ecosystem of the area and demonstrated the sustainability of the use and customary practices. The awareness of the IPs in the Highlands, old and younger generations, is high and this has led to their declaration for organic cultivation and securing certification to further strengthen the traditional agricultural system. The local government has issued a decree for the protection of the system (traditional occupation and livelihoods).

#### **Some examples of traditional occupations/livelihoods dependant on biodiversity**

- In Finland, Indigenous Sámi reindeer herding is dependent on old-growth forests that are important sources of tree growing lichen (*Bryoria fuscescens*). This lichen is vital for reindeer in critical winter months when the ground is covered with ice and reindeer cannot graze on ground growing lichens.
- In Uganda, Nomadic Pastoralism, with a population of 2.3 million, represents 95% of the population. It has three pillars: natural resources, the livestock herd and pastoral society and institutions. 75% of men are engaged as cattle keepers while 60% of women remain engaged in domestic chores.
- In Malawi, communities depend on biodiversity for medicinal products administered by traditional doctors, as well as for a cultural dance called “Gule wankulu” (meaning the “greatest dance”).
- In Venezuela, one example is the use of fibre that comes from the curagua plant, which is used for different fabrics, baskets, hammocks. This tradition is carried out by all the community and is passed on to the new generations. Another example is the production of a liquor called cocuy, which comes from the fermented musts of the Agave plant, and is made by the communities of Pecaya, this liquor has a certificate of origin and serves as sustenance for the rural communities of the state of Falcón.
- In Canada, indigenous peoples have cultural, economic and health needs that are closely related to the conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity. Many indigenous families supplement their nutritional needs by harvesting traditional/ country foods. Within indigenous communities, most (if not all) occupations are dependent on biodiversity, and are delineated by related skills, gender roles and inter-generational responsibilities (e.g., Elders, knowledge keepers, hunters, teachers).
- Many other participants also listed hunters, farmers, fishers, traditional medical practitioners and artisans in their countries as dependent on biodiversity.

#### **Online Discussion Forum**

The following questions were posted to the online discussion forum under the thread Customary Sustainable Use:

*Forum Question 1. How can customary sustainable use (CSU) be strengthened, protected and encouraged in the global biodiversity framework?*

- Many participants stated that the post-2020 global biodiversity framework should:
  - Recognize the important role that traditional knowledge and CSU play in in situ biodiversity conservation and sustainable use (as in CBD Articles 8(j) and 10(c)).
  - Acknowledge the link between loss of indigenous culture and territories and global biodiversity loss.

- Integrate the protection of indigenous territories, rights and traditional knowledge and self-determination across the framework.
- Ensure land tenure to protect biodiversity and its sustainable use in a just and rights-based manner.
- Many participants stated that CSU can be strengthened, protected and encouraged through capacity-building, networking and the mainstreaming of traditional knowledge and CSU in all decision-making processes.
- One participant noted that BioTrade, trade with biodiversity-based and biodiversity-friendly sourced products, strengthens CSU through providing economic opportunities to indigenous peoples and local communities, municipalities and actors who apply practices which are conserving and sustainably using biodiversity and ensuring ABS.
- One participant noted that traditional knowledge needs to be integrated in national environment plans.
- One participant warned not to fall into a paradigm that frames all use by rural, traditional communities as sustainable, even where there is no commercial use by said communities.
- One participant noted that it is crucial to recognize that sustainability is a dynamic concept: customary uses that were sustainable at low population levels might no longer be so when more people are targeting the same resources for direct consumption, and even less so when they are also harvesting extra to sell to commercial biotrade markets (but with good management such markets might be highly sustainable).

*Forum Question 2. How can issues related to land tenure, joint management of protected areas or indigenous peoples and local communities conserved territories, and secure access to terrestrial, fresh water, and marine flora and fauna be integrated into the global biodiversity framework?*

- One participant highlighted the need for specific targets on indigenous peoples and local communities (including women) rights over resources and traditional governance including CSU practices and related benefits, as well as guidelines for the recognition and protection of land tenure rights for indigenous peoples and local communities.
- Some participants found the boundaries of what activities of non-indigenous local communities are and are not “customary use” confusing.

*Forum Question 3. What milestone, component, monitoring element or indicator could be strengthened in the global biodiversity framework for customary sustainable use monitoring?*

- One participant mentioned that there is no equivalent dedicated target to Aichi Target 18, nor direct reference to CSU as such in the updated zero draft of the global biodiversity framework.
- One participant highlighted that sites recognized for CSU in programmes such as MAB and GIAHS should be monitored and included in CBD processes.
- One participant suggested that the recognition of the self-governed territories of indigenous peoples and local communities as effective area-based conservation measures needs to be measured in the global biodiversity framework.
- One participant believed there are no specific indicators that are going to be broadly appropriate for a planet supporting diverse cultures, thus indicators of activities considered inconsistent with values of most cultures should be used.
- New suggested target: “By 2030, appropriately recognize and secure 100% of the rights to the lands and waters traditionally and collectively governed by indigenous peoples and local communities

for the conservation and the sustainable use of biodiversity and respect their right to Free Prior and Informed Consent”.

- Suggested additional sources for indicators: *Local Biodiversity Outlook* on traditional knowledge and practices; ICCA Registry.

### **Closing Webinar**

#### **Comments from breakout group discussions**

- Integrating CSU in the framework:
  - CSU needs to be incorporated into more indicators across the framework (see for example Indigenous Navigator, LBO, etc. for existing indicators that could be adopted).
  - Elements on customary sustainable use can be incorporated to most sustainable use related targets especially in terms of monitoring.
  - CSU is a cross-cutting theme, should not just be in one target and needs to be reflected in all targets.
  - Respecting, protecting, securing and promoting customary land tenure and the practice of traditional knowledge needs to be a priority for the framework.
  - We need a target on protecting rights of indigenous peoples and local communities. Use rights are an essential instrument of conservation.
  - Important to provide incentives/livelihood opportunities and build long-term partnerships with custodians of biodiversity.
  - Domesticated species are important for customary uses.
  - Secure tenure of rights holders, indigenous peoples and local communities, land custodians.
  - Mainstreaming gender issues, youth and women.
  - Coexistence of different forms of sustainable use is important.
  - Important to recognize and generate a transformative science that incorporates traditional knowledge and scientific knowledge.
  - Many databases exist on CSU and the CBD could raise awareness on these databases.
- The importance of CBMS:
  - Community-based monitoring and information systems and other initiatives of indigenous peoples and local communities, such as the *Local Biodiversity Outlooks*, should be strengthened by increasing the capacity of indigenous peoples and local communities to contribute with data for the post-2020 global biodiversity framework.
  - Supporting community-based monitoring is important, especially to properly capture the contributions of indigenous peoples and local communities to sustainable use.
- Having the right governance framework and ensuring that indigenous peoples and local communities have the governance rights in place so that they can continue with their CSU practices is key.
- Ensuring that customary use is sustainable:
  - Do not forget that, in some cases, customary uses of biodiversity are not sustainable, especially when there is a lack of local good governance of the commons. It is important

to identify and monitor and see how the sustainability/transformation of these practices can be facilitated and increased.

- Make a link between customary sustainable use and customary sustainable management — CSU needs to increase biodiversity.
- Differentiating between uses when considering benefits to people is important.
- CSU is not necessarily linked to indigenous peoples and this should be considered.
- The inequity of distribution and access to resources is a challenge, and this should be addressed.

#### **Terminology where clarification is needed**

- |                    |                            |
|--------------------|----------------------------|
| • Sustainable      | • Integrity                |
| • Wild species     | • Healthy ecosystem        |
| • Wildlife         | • Biodiversity value       |
| • Legal            | • Sustainable consumption  |
| • Safe             | • Sustainable production   |
| • Harvest          | • Sustainable supply chain |
| • Trade            | • Mainstreaming            |
| • Use              | • Overexploitation         |
| • Productivity gap |                            |

#### **Sustainable use of biodiversity in other targets of the framework**

The following suggestions were provided by respondents in response to question 14 of the online survey. The online survey questions can be found in annex IV below.

##### **General comments**

- Some respondents indicated that education or awareness-raising activities should be included as part of the draft monitoring framework for the post-2020 global biodiversity framework.
- Respondents also suggested the inclusion of technology and innovation incorporated into agricultural systems and other productive systems that promote the conservation of biodiversity in the framework.
- A comment was made indicating that both Targets 14 and 15 rely heavily on existing SDG language and metrics and there is a need to clarify in what way the global biodiversity framework is specifically contributing to achieving them.

##### **Suggestions to strengthen the sustainable use of biological diversity across different targets of the framework**

- **Target 1:**
  - In Targets 1 and 2, recognition of the lands, waters, territories and resources of indigenous peoples should be recognized as a separate land category from PAs and OECMs as well as in national legislation, to ensure that customary sustainable use by indigenous peoples is recognized, strengthened and protected from criminalization.
  - All (not 50%) land and sea should be under some form of planning, including production areas where sustainable use takes place. “Planning” can include all land-uses, and it should be considered everywhere. Use should be sustainable overall and for the long term, which can be achieved by applying a landscape approach at multiple scales.

- **Target 2:**

- The target should recognize that protected areas are not limited to no-touch zones, and that a continuum of different levels of use exists inside and beyond protected areas.
- Protected areas policy is also an area relevant to sustainable use, and the target should reflect that protected areas and OECMs have to fit into an overall landscape that enables sustainable use and healthy ecosystems in order to be effective.
- OECMs also need to include human, cultural, and societal elements, and also coverage of KBAs.
- Include areas under sustainable use, such as territories of indigenous peoples and local communities, especially where they overlap with PAs and KBAs.

- **Target 3:**

- “Active management actions” apply to both wild and non-wild species. The framework also needs to consider recovery and conservation of species actively cultivated, managed, and used by humans.
- Sustainable use can be a key tool to address human-wildlife conflict. Some highlighted that it is not clear why the focus is only on ex situ conservation measures.
- This target could have the following additional component: “Engagement with stakeholders and beneficiaries to ensure sustainable use of biodiversity.”
- Sustainable use should be explicitly included in the monitoring framework for Target 3. Sustainable use can be one form of “active management action” that enable species recovery. It should not be assumed that the management action should be preventing use, when at times and when well regulated, use provides a positive incentive for conservation, a crucial knowledge base and ongoing monitoring of ecosystems.

- **Target 5:**

- The target should also include an element of sustainable use as invasive alien species (IAS) can have a negative impact on sustainable use of biodiversity. This could be made explicit and monitored in terms of the amount of sustainable use that is damaged by IAS.
- The design on any land and landscape and the introduction of plant species should take into consideration the risk of IAS and the role of plantings for plant and animal biodiversity from a local and landscape biodiversity point of view. Choice of plants to use in landscaping is clearly of relevance for sustainable use. Landscaping is also highly relevant for creating a sustainable use of the landscape – landscape practices in cities, peri-urban areas and smaller towns can contribute or hinder the ecological connectivity in the overall landscape.

- **Target 6:**

- This target aims to reduce pollution but does not explicitly state that pollution can be the result of unsustainable use. Pollution is also a sustainable use issue, as any use that produces too much pollution cannot be sustainable. Use activities could be added to the list of “trends in pollution from...”.
- The target should have a component focused on sustainable use of agricultural diversity to prevent pollution from excess nutrients and biocides.

- **Target 7:**



- A component focused on sustainable forestry practices can prevent the loss of forest cover and help mitigate climate change.
- **Target 10:**
  - Assuming that trends in ecosystems contributing to air quality is eventually going to include forest ecosystems, it should also be pointed out that sustainably managed productive ecosystems can also contribute to air quality regulation, not only perceived “wild” areas.
- **Target 11:**
  - Sustainable use is also relevant to biodiversity and human health, in that sustainably produced goods are healthier for people. Trends in contributions to human health from sustainably produced products could be added to the elements.
- **Target 12:**
  - The focus should be changed from “increasing benefits” to sustainably using and equitably sharing the benefits from genetic resources.
  - The target should also incorporate a component related to sustainable use in relation to the use of pathogens by the biopharmaceutical industry.
  - Customary sustainable use of resources (genetic, biological and ecosystem services) should be protected from negative impacts arising from access to resources in the territories of indigenous peoples.
- **Target 14:**
  - Many supply chains include wild-sourced species/products and there is scope for reforming economic sectors towards sustainable practices along the supply chains for wildlife trade.
  - Production practices and supply chains are directly linked to possibilities for sustainable consumption patterns. Production and supply chains trigger consumption and vice versa. These are intrinsically linked and cannot be separated.
  - There is a discrepancy between the target components and the monitoring elements and related indicators, since the indicators proposed in the draft monitoring framework do not measure the proposed monitoring elements. Target element T14.1. “Reduction of at least [50%] in negative impacts on biodiversity”, monitoring element “Trends in ecological limits reached or surpassed” and proposed indicators.
- **Target 17:**
  - This target should include incentive reforms to support sustainable use of biodiversity. One example for the agricultural sector is the introduction of incentives to apply a biocontrol approach.
  - A suggestion was made to reword component 17.2 to focus on resource mobilization in order to support the increase in neutral or positive incentives for the conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity, following the positive language agreed by the post-2020 global biodiversity framework negotiation process.
- **Target 19:**
  - The current elements and indicators do not seem to contain anything about information and traditional knowledge on sustainable use. It would be better to

explicitly add these in this target to make sure they are not overlooked in implementation.

**General comments on the post-2020 global biodiversity framework with focus beyond the sustainable use of biodiversity**

- Some disagreement existed between participants on the periodicity of indicators, some advocated for more frequent updating, while some advocated for less.
- Many participants highlighted the need for an ambitious framework with a strong implementation mechanism and SMART targets.
- Some participants suggested simplifying the wording of the Goals to remove inclusion of methods and strategies.
- Participants mentioned that it is important to consider transformative change within the framework.
- One participant noted that there is a need to add to the targets not only effective means of action but equitable means of action which will need to include social and economic considerations. These need to be very clearly stated at the target level to move into monitoring actions later. This is particularly important for gender mainstreaming along the framework.

### Annex III

## SUGGESTED ADDITIONS AND CHANGES TO THE DRAFT MONITORING FRAMEWORK

The following suggestions pertain to the draft monitoring framework for the post-2020 global biodiversity framework made available for peer review for the twenty-fourth meeting of the Subsidiary Body on Scientific, Technical and Technological Advice.<sup>10</sup> Text changes or additions in **black and bold** were suggested in the online survey; text changes or additions in **blue and bold** were suggested in the online discussion forum.

**Table 1. Proposed changes to the draft monitoring framework for Target 4**

<i>Target 4 suggestions</i>	<i>Component suggestions</i>	<i>Monitoring element suggestions</i>	<i>Indicator suggestions</i>
<p>By 2030, ensure that the harvesting, trade and use of wild species of fauna and flora, is legal, at sustainable levels and safe</p> <p>By 2030, ensure that the harvesting on the base the capacity to recover, trade and use of wild species of fauna and flora, is legal, at sustainable levels and safe</p> <p>By 2030, ensure that any harvesting, trade and use of wild species of fauna and flora, respects legislation, and is at sustainable levels and safe</p> <p>By 2030, ensure that the harvesting, trade and use of wild species of fauna and flora, is legal, safe and at sustainable and productive levels, within resilient ecosystems</p> <p>By 2030, reduce the overexploitation of wild species of fauna and flora by illegal and unsustainable harvesting, use and trade (domestic and international)</p>	<p>T4.1. Harvest is legal, sustainable and safe for human health and biodiversity</p> <p>Harvest is sustainable, legal, safe and fair for human health and well-being and biodiversity, taking into account and respecting customary sustainable use of indigenous peoples and local communities</p>	<p>Trends in proportion of biological resources harvested legally</p>	<p>Proportion of traded wildlife that was poached or illicitly trafficked (SDG indicators 15.7.1 and 15.c.1)</p> <p>Degree of implementation of international instruments aiming to combat illegal, unreported and unregulated fishing (SDG indicator 14.6.1)</p> <p>Number of countries which possess legal/regulatory frameworks to protect and control (and manage) biological resources</p> <p>(Number of) countries which apply international/regional/national legislation on harvesting and (or) trade</p> <p>Annual game bag census data, annual counting data for birds, brood and pair counts</p> <p>Annual assessment of the population and population trends</p> <p>Red listed species; extinct/recovering</p> <p>Population trends of endangered species due to overexploitation</p>

<sup>10</sup> <https://www.cbd.int/sbotta/sbotta-24/post2020-monitoring-en.pdf>

<i>Target 4 suggestions</i>	<i>Component suggestions</i>	<i>Monitoring element suggestions</i>	<i>Indicator suggestions</i>
<p>By 2030, ensure that the harvesting, trade and use of wild species is legal, sustainable, operates within safe ecological limits, applies ecosystem-based approaches and is without adverse impacts on non-target species and ecosystems</p> <p>By 2030, put in place and implement measures to ensure that all direct and indirect harvesting, trade and use of wild terrestrial, freshwater and marine species, is legal and ecologically sustainable, including by applying the ecosystem approach to fisheries, and urgently address both demand and supply of illegal wildlife products</p> <p>By 2030, ensure that the harvesting, trade and use of wild species of fauna and flora, is legal, at sustainable levels and safe, taking into account and respecting customary sustainable use of indigenous peoples and local communities</p> <p>By 2030, ensure that harvest, trade and use of wild species is within legal limits or parameters, are at sustainable levels and safe for human health and biodiversity</p> <p>By 2030, Ensure that illegal harvest, trade and use of wild species is controlled, and are at sustainable levels and safe for human health and biodiversity</p>			Biological resource stocks within biologically sustainable levels (stable or growing)
		<p>Trends in proportion of biological resources harvested within the established harvest limits</p> <p>Trends in proportion of biological resources harvested within the established sustainable harvest limits</p>	<p>Proportion of fish stocks within biologically sustainable levels (SDG indicator 14.4.1)</p> <p>Proportion of biological resources harvested through sustainable quotas</p>
		<p>Trends in proportion of biological resources harvested through sustainable harvest practices</p> <p>Trends in the sustainability of harvest of terrestrial (repeat for freshwater/marine/other etc.) species for consumptive/commercial /other etc. use</p>	<p>Number of UEBT-certified ingredients</p> <p>Volumes of UEBT-certified ingredients</p> <p>Number of biological resources harvested in line with BioTrade Principles and Criteria</p> <p><a href="#">The degree of which States and competent organizations are implementing an ecosystem approach to fisheries (See FAO, The Ecosystem Approach to Fisheries, Technical Guidelines for Responsible Fisheries, No. 4, Suppl.2, 2003)</a></p> <p><a href="#">Trends and status of ecosystem structure and function (see Garcia, S.M. and Rice, J. Assessing Progress towards Aichi Biodiversity Target 6 on Sustainable Marine Fisheries. Technical Series No. 87. Secretariat of the Convention on Biological Diversity, Montreal, 103 pages)</a></p>
		Trends in measures ensuring safe harvesting operations	Countries adopting green procurement practices for timber products and wood products
		Trends in implementation of measures designed to minimize impacts of fisheries and hunting on migratory species, their	<p>Number of harvesting operations developed on base of wildlife population and habitat evaluations</p> <p>Number of subsidies paid for damage caused by wildlife, assessing yearly the annual changes in costs. (Data exists</p>

<i>Target 4 suggestions</i>	<i>Component suggestions</i>	<i>Monitoring element suggestions</i>	<i>Indicator suggestions</i>
<p>By 2030, ensure that [X%] of wild species of fauna and flora are harvested legally and at sustainable levels</p> <p>Ensure that by 2030 measures are adopted to address unsustainable and illegal harvesting, trade, and use of wild species, to tackle overexploitation</p> <p>By 2030, ensure that the use of wild species of fauna and flora occurs when necessary to achieve human well-being, and that trade-offs of any use are analysed and validated as sustainable</p> <p>By 2030, end illegal harvesting and trade of wild species, and ensure that all harvesting, trade and use of wild species is ecologically sustainable, effectively regulated and complies with national and international regulations and commitments, while providing benefits such as nutrition and livelihoods to people</p> <p>By 2030, ensure that the harvesting, trade and use of wild species of fauna and flora, is sustainable, legal, safe, and fair, taking into account and respecting customary sustainable use of indigenous peoples and local communities</p>		habitats and their migratory routes (Convention on Migratory Species)	<p>for large carnivores, certain ungulates and protected species.)</p> <p>Number of NBSAPs identifying wild species used at the national level and evaluating means of maintaining or attaining sustainable use</p> <p><a href="#">The status of threatened species and vulnerable ecosystems and corresponding conservation and management measures applied to those</a></p> <p><a href="#">Degree of implementation by States and competent organizations of measures to: (a) eliminate or minimise bycatch, (b) require impact assessments (as per UNFSA, Art. 5(d); (c) impose rebuilding plans with the shortest feasible timeframes; (d) protect habitats; (e) eliminate destructive fishing practices; (f) prioritize small scale fishing that supports livelihoods of indigenous peoples and local communities over industrial fishing in the territorial seas</a></p>
		Trends in amounts of biological resources harvested illegally	Proportion of traded wildlife that was poached or illicitly trafficked
		Trends in amounts of biological resources harvested above established harvest limits	Number of threatened species by unsustainable harvesting, trade and use
		Trends in amounts of biological resources harvested through unsustainable harvest practices	Area of tree cover loss from primary forest (as defined by FAO)
		Trends in population and extinction risk in bycatch species	Habitat destruction by bottom-contacting gear, including essential fish habitats
			Illegal harvesting of marine species
			The Red List Index (impacts of fisheries).
			Living Planet Index (LPI) (trends in target and bycatch species)

<i>Target 4 suggestions</i>	<i>Component suggestions</i>	<i>Monitoring element suggestions</i>	<i>Indicator suggestions</i>
			Unsustainable exploitation of or damaging impacts on by-catch of non-targeted species <a href="#">The status of target and non-target stocks</a>
		Trends in zoonoses at the national, regional and international level. Monitoring elements could be studied with WHO	
	T4.2. Trade is legal, sustainable and safe for human health and biodiversity  Trade is legal, traceable, sustainable and safe for human health and biodiversity	Trends in proportion of biological resources traded legally	Change in the [number/proportion] of CITES Parties with legislation in Category 1 under the National Legislation Project (CITES as the owner annual data available)  Changes in Endangered/Critically Endangered species reported in international trade (data are available for annual analyses but currently run every 3 years under the CITES Review of Significant Trade process via UNEP-WCMC, trend could be back-dated as far as IUCN data are available, data source CITES Trade Database and IUCN Red List)  <a href="#">Change in the [number/proportion] species considered threatened by international trade (This indicator monitors trends in time in the number of species assessed by the IUCN Red List as threatened by trade. It should be available in 2021 and could be run at least every three years. Trends could be back-dated as far as IUCN data are available. Data source = IUCN Red List.)</a>  The proportion of wildlife products that are accompanied by harvest licences, transport permits, export permits, and relevant legal instruments (including CITES permits and certificates)  Reductions in consumer demand for illegal products (or increased consumer demand for proven sustainable supplies)  Species of flora and fauna that have been downlisted from Appendix I of CITES.

<i>Target 4 suggestions</i>	<i>Component suggestions</i>	<i>Monitoring element suggestions</i>	<i>Indicator suggestions</i>
			<p>The proportion of the value of illegally traded flora and fauna (endemic, high value, endangered) to the total value of traded flora and fauna carried out legally</p> <p>Rates of decrease in species illegal traffic</p> <p>Number of networks for the coordination and cooperation of police entities and for the control of illegal trafficking of wild species at the national level and between countries</p> <p>Proportion of biological resources traded legally</p>
		Trends in proportion of biological resources traded within the established limits/quotas	<p>Proportion of traded biological resources from within existing harvest limits</p> <p>Proportion of biological resources traded on base quotas or other limitations (size, period, males, females, ages)</p> <p>The proportion of wildlife products from approved inventories, quotas, derived from CITES Non-detrimental Findings and other proof of sustainable harvest</p>
		Trends in measures ensuring safety of trade operations	The proportion of wildlife products with proof of phytosanitary, sanitary inspections against diseases and zoonotic transmissions
		Trends in exports and imports of biodiversity-based products that is sustainable (for instance in line with BioTrade Principles & Criteria and/or CITES requirements)	<p>Value and trends of exports/imports in biodiversity-based products</p> <p>Trends of trade and commercialization in biodiversity-based products that is sustainable and legal</p> <p>Number of countries where UEBT members source ingredients from</p> <p>Number of Trade Agreements specifically addressing sustainable commodities or commodities requiring sustainability certification</p>
	T4.3. Use is legal, sustainable and safe	Trends in proportion of biological resources used legally	

<i>Target 4 suggestions</i>	<i>Component suggestions</i>	<i>Monitoring element suggestions</i>	<i>Indicator suggestions</i>
	for human health and biodiversity.	Trends in proportion of biological resources used legally with adequate benefit-sharing agreements	
		Trends in proportion of biological resources used within the established limits/quotas	
		Trends in measures ensuring safe use of biodiversity	
		Trends in legislation that guarantees the sustainable use of biodiversity	
		Trends in claims made to legal authorities, resolution of legal cases related to the illegal harvest/-commercialization/use of biodiversity, and the compensation for damages or crimes committed	
	T4.4. Recognition of customary sustainable use for human health and biodiversity	<p>Trends in biological resources governed under customary sustainable use practices or policies, as appropriate</p> <p>Trends in the recognition and respect of customary sustainable use requirements and practices in relation to harvest/ trade/ sustainable use of wild fauna and flora</p>	<p>Number of disputes the State has successfully resolved to recognize Indigenous Peoples' authority to manage hunting, fishing, gathering, pastoralizing</p> <p>% of indigenous peoples and local communities territories of life (conserved territories) recognized and increased</p> <p>% of territories of life (conserved territories) added to the governmental reports of protected areas towards 2030</p> <p>The proportion of total adult population with secure tenure rights to land, (a) with legally recognized documentation, and (b) who perceive their rights to land as secure, by sex and type of tenure (SDG Indicator 1.4.2)</p> <p>Quality and vitality of customary practices (ICCAs, LMMAs) used to manage aquatic and terrestrial wild species. The LBO (produced every 4 years) is a source of</p>



<i>Target 4 suggestions</i>	<i>Component suggestions</i>	<i>Monitoring element suggestions</i>	<i>Indicator suggestions</i>
			<p>this data, plus documentation that might be in local registries and the ICCAs registry.</p> <p>Trends in land-use change and land tenure in the traditional territories of indigenous and local communities (decision X/43)</p> <p>Trends in the practice of traditional occupations (decision X/43)</p> <p>Trends in which traditional knowledge and practices are respected through their full integration, safeguards and the full and effective participation of indigenous and local communities in the national implementation of the Strategic Plan</p>
		Trends in proportion of countries recognizing traditional medicine	Number of countries recognizing traditional medicine of indigenous peoples

**Table 2. Proposed changes to the draft monitoring framework for Target 8**

<i>Target 8 suggestions</i>	<i>Component suggestions</i>	<i>Monitoring element suggestions</i>	<i>Indicator suggestions</i>
<p>By 2030, ensure benefits, including nutrition, food security, livelihoods, health and well-being, for people, especially for the most vulnerable through sustainable management of wild species of fauna and flora</p> <p>By 2030, ensure <b>substantial, sustained and equitable</b> benefits, including nutrition, food security, livelihoods, <b>education, scientific understanding</b>, health and well-being, for people, especially for the most vulnerable through sustainable management of wild species of fauna and flora</p> <p>By 2030, <b>sustainably manage wild species of fauna and flora, as a contribution to ensuring direct and indirect, social, economic and cultural benefits for people</b>, especially the most vulnerable</p> <p><b>By 2030, establish sustainable food production systems and wild species management which help maintain ecosystems and improve land and soil quality to ensure long term access by all people, in particular the poor and people in vulnerable situations, including infants, to safe, nutritious and sufficient food all year round</b></p> <p>By 2030, <b>ensure that people, especially vulnerable rural communities, benefit from nature, in terms of</b> nutrition, food security, livelihoods, health and well-</p>	T8.1. Sustainable management of aquatic wild species of fauna and flora, including fisheries	Trends in fish stocks	<p>Proportion of fish stocks within biologically sustainable levels</p> <p><b>Number of fish stocks within biologically sustainable levels</b></p> <p>Sustainable fisheries as a percentage of GDP in small island developing States, least developed countries and all countries (SDG indicator 14.7.1)</p> <p>Number of fish stocks within biologically sustainable levels, or the reverse, to reduce the number of unsustainably fished stocks to zero, and the second could be the proportion managed sustainably</p>
		<p>Trends in sustainable fisheries management</p> <p>Trends in sustainable fisheries management, <b>including customary sustainable use and management by indigenous peoples and local communities</b></p> <p>Trends in <b>ecosystem-based</b> fisheries management</p>	<p>Proportion of fish stocks within biologically sustainable levels (SDG indicator 14.4.1)</p> <p><b>Proportion of fish stocks managed sustainably</b></p> <p>Degree of implementation of international instruments aiming to combat illegal, unreported and unregulated fishing (SDG indicator 14.6.1)</p> <p>Degree of implementation of international instruments aiming to combat illegal, unreported and unregulated fishing (SDG indicator 14.6.1)</p> <p>MSC Certified Catch</p> <p><b>MCS certified catch as a percentage of total catch</b></p> <p>Degree of application of a legal/regulatory/policy/-institutional framework which recognizes and protects access rights for small-scale fisheries (SDG indicator 14.B.1)</p> <p><b>Proportion of fish stocks under customary sustainable use and management by indigenous peoples and local communities</b></p>

<i>Target 8 suggestions</i>	<i>Component suggestions</i>	<i>Monitoring element suggestions</i>	<i>Indicator suggestions</i>
<p>being, through sustainable management of wild species of fauna and flora</p> <p>By 2030, ensure benefits <b>contributing to fundamental human well-being</b>, especially for the most vulnerable through sustainable management of wild species of fauna and flora</p> <p>By 2030, ensure benefits, including nutrition, food security, livelihoods, health and well-being, for people, especially for the most vulnerable through sustainable <b>use and management, including through customary practices</b>, of wild species of fauna and flora</p> <p>By 2030, ensure benefits <b>from biodiversity</b>, including nutrition, food security, livelihoods, health and well-being, for people, especially for the most vulnerable through sustainable management of wild species of fauna and flora</p> <p>By 2030, ensure benefits, including nutrition, food security, livelihoods, health and well-being, for people, especially for the most vulnerable <b>through protection and</b> sustainable management of wild species of fauna and flora and their ecosystems</p> <p>By 2030, ensure <b>that benefits arising from the sustainable utilization of nature's contributions to people and associated traditional knowledge are shared fairly and equitably, taking</b></p>			<b>Number of countries using ecosystem-based approaches to manage marine areas</b> (SDG indicator 14.2.1)
		Trends in population and extinction risk in bycatch species	Red List Index (albatrosses and large petrels) <b>Red List Index, should extend to all marine mammals in addition to albatrosses and petrels</b> Living Planet Index (LPI) (trends in target and bycatch species)
		Trends in aquatic plants	<b>Proportion of aquatic plants harvested by quotas and restrictions annual temporary or areas closed</b>
		Trends in invertebrate stocks	Proportion of fish stocks under sustainable management certification schemes
	T8.2. Sustainable management of terrestrial wild species of fauna and flora	Trends in terrestrial wild species of fauna used for food and medicine	Number of plant and animal genetic resources for food and agriculture secured in medium- or long-term conservation facilities (SDG indicator 2.5.1)
		Trend in terrestrial wild species of fauna <b>and flora</b> used for food and medicine.	Average income of small-scale food producers, by sex and indigenous status (SDG indicator 2.3.2)
		Trends in terrestrial wild species of fauna <b>and flora</b> used for food, medicine, textile fibres, wood for building and energy production, raw materials for industrial products such as lubricants, perfumes, paper, waxes and rubber (which are mostly obtained from plants), ornamental plants, trophies, pets, other products obtained from animals such as silk,	Volume of production per labour unit by classes of farming/pastoral/ forestry enterprise size (SDG indicator 2.3.1) <b>SDG Indicator 2.5.2 Proportion of local breeds classified as being at risk of extinction</b> <b>Trends in terrestrial wild species of fauna and flora used as raw materials</b> <b>Number of plant and animal genetic resources sustainably used and conserved on lands and territories of indigenous peoples and local communities</b> <b>Diversity of flora and fauna used for food security, livelihoods, and health and well-being</b> <b>Comprehensiveness of conservation of socioeconomically as well as culturally valuable species</b>

<i>Target 8 suggestions</i>	<i>Component suggestions</i>	<i>Monitoring element suggestions</i>	<i>Indicator suggestions</i>
<b>into account intergenerational equity and the gender perspective</b> (see CBD/WG2020/2/4, Page 8)		<b>leather, hides, tourism and recreational activities</b>  Trends in terrestrial wild species of fauna and flora used for food and medicine, <b>including customary sustainable use by indigenous peoples and local communities</b>  Trends in terrestrial wild species of flora <b>used as timber and non-timber products, including for food, medicine, cosmetics</b>  <b>Trends in terrestrial wild species</b>	(responsible is Alliance of Bioversity and CIAT, and Crop Trust)  <b>Trends in the legal trade of medicinal plants</b>
		<b>Trends in local institutions and mechanisms to promote conservation and sustainable use of local biodiversity</b>	
		<b>Trends in terrestrial wild species of fauna for hunting</b>	<b>Proportion of hunting areas with sustainable management</b>  <b>Number of species that have a protection and their hunting is allowed</b>  <b>Number of people that have been attacked/murdered due to illegal hunting</b>  <b>Degree of implementation of international instruments aiming to combat illegal, unreported and unregulated hunting</b>
	<b>T8.3. Change in benefits, including enhanced nutrition,</b>	<b>Increase in the number of people benefiting from sustainable use and</b>	<b>Number of people harvesting and trading wild plant and fungi products benefiting from the FairWild Premium prices and Premium Fund.</b>

<i>Target 8 suggestions</i>	<i>Component suggestions</i>	<i>Monitoring element suggestions</i>	<i>Indicator suggestions</i>
	<p><b>food security, and livelihoods from sustainable use and trade in wild species</b></p> <p><b>Benefits, including nutrition, food security, livelihoods, health, and well-being ensured for people, especially for the most vulnerable</b></p> <p><b>Nature's material contributions including food, water and others</b></p> <p><b>Nature's regulating contributions including climate regulation, disaster prevention and other</b></p>	<p><b>equitable trade in species of wild fauna and flora</b></p>	<p><b>Number of marine species managed using traceability schemes</b></p> <p><b>Trends in consumption of diverse locally produced food, disaggregated by sex, age, and indigenous status</b></p> <p><b>Diversity of flora and fauna used for food security, livelihoods, and health and well-being</b></p> <p><b>Access to affordable, healthy, safe, and adequate food, disaggregated by sex, age, and indigenous status</b></p> <p><b>Indicators under SDG 2, 3, and 6</b></p> <p><b>Percentage of waters achieving sustainable abstraction</b></p> <p><b>Percentage of commodities that are sources from certified sustainable sources</b></p> <p><b>Degree to which States are implementing the principles in the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples</b></p>
	<p><b>T8.4. Customary sustainable use of wild species of fauna and flora</b></p> <p><b>Protect and encourage customary sustainable use of wild species of fauna and flora</b> (Article 10 (c))</p>	<p><b>Trends in practice of active management of wild species, including through customary sustainable use as captured by community-based monitoring and information systems (CBMIS)</b></p> <p><b>Trends in the practice of traditional occupations</b></p>	<p><b>Number of countries implementing Article 10 (c) of the Convention on Biological Diversity and the global plan of action on customary sustainable use of biological diversity</b></p> <p><b>Number of Parties including collective actions of indigenous peoples and local communities in national reporting</b></p> <p><b>Indicator on indigenous peoples and local communities' food security, nutrition and livelihoods</b></p> <p><b>The number of indigenous people and/or traditional or resource-dependent communities that harvest fish for</b></p>

<i>Target 8 suggestions</i>	<i>Component suggestions</i>	<i>Monitoring element suggestions</i>	<i>Indicator suggestions</i>
			<b>food, social and ceremonial purposes</b> (Suggest establishing a baseline and then reporting on trends.)
		<b>Trends in securing land and resources of indigenous peoples and local communities</b> (Note: operationalization of T20 in relation to rights to resources)	<b>indigenous peoples and local communities' seed banks in situ (and deposited in ex situ collections, e.g. IP potatoes at Svalbard)</b> <b>Number of Parties adopting policies and action plans on customary sustainable use</b> <b>Number of biodiversity strategies and action plans/land use and management plans formulated for indigenous peoples and local communities</b> <b>Number of countries with action taken to enhance decent rural employment opportunities, entrepreneurship and skills development, especially for youth</b> (United Nations Decade of Family Farming) <b>Number of countries with an improved set of institutions and strategies—including policies, guidelines, regulations and tools and programmes—aiming to generate decent rural employment, particularly for youth</b> (United Nations Decade of Family Farming) <b>Number of countries with an improved set of institutions and strategies—including policies, guidelines, regulations and tools and programmes—aiming to generate decent rural employment, including for women</b> (United Nations Decade of Family Farming) <b>Number of countries with action taken to accelerate gender equality and rural women's economic empowerment</b> (United Nations Decade of Family Farming)
	<b>T8.5. Sustainable management of wetland-related wild species of fauna and flora</b>		<b>Trends in composition of Ramsar sites</b>

<i>Target 8 suggestions</i>	<i>Component suggestions</i>	<i>Monitoring element suggestions</i>	<i>Indicator suggestions</i>
	<b>T8.6 Increased food diversity (Prioritize study and promotion of alternative sustainable food products)</b>		
	<b>T8.7. Sustainable management of wild species of pathogens and microorganisms, through support for the research and development of vaccines and medicines for the communicable and non-communicable diseases by safeguarding facilitated timely access to pathogen samples and relevant sequence data</b>	<b>Trends in access to pathogens</b>	<p><b>Quantification of value of research and development related to pathogens based on its timely sharing. Including the value added by countries which facilitate timely access to pathogens.</b></p> <p><b>An increase in the number of countries which have implemented simplified legal frameworks that facilitate timely access to pathogen samples and relevant sequence data.</b></p> <p><b>The delay caused by biodiversity-related requirements does not exceed one month.</b></p>

**Table 3. Proposed changes to the draft monitoring framework for Target 9**

<i>Target 9 suggestions</i>	<i>Component suggestions</i>	<i>Monitoring element suggestions</i>	<i>Indicator suggestions</i>
<p>By 2030, support the productivity, sustainability and resilience of biodiversity in agricultural and other managed ecosystems through conservation and sustainable use of such ecosystems, reducing productivity gaps by at least [50%]</p> <p>By 2030, <b>conserve and enhance the proportion of use of biodiversity in agricultural and other managed ecosystems that is sustainable to [80]%</b></p> <p>By 2030, support the sustainability and resilience of biodiversity in agricultural and other managed ecosystems through conservation and sustainable use of such ecosystems, <b>such that [50%] of agricultural ecosystems are under recognized forms of sustainable agriculture while still meeting human needs</b></p> <p>By 2030, support the productivity, sustainability and resilience of biodiversity in agricultural and other managed ecosystems <b>through integrated approaches for conservation and sustainable use of such ecosystems</b></p> <p><b>Conserve and improve the</b> sustainable use of biodiversity in agricultural and other managed ecosystems, <b>in order to maintain</b> productivity, sustainability and the resilience of these systems, reducing,</p>	<p>T9.1. Sustainable management of agricultural biodiversity, including soil biodiversity, cultivated plants and farmed and domesticated animals and of wild relatives</p> <p>Sustainable management of agricultural biodiversity, including soil biodiversity, <b>pollinators</b>, cultivated plants and farmed and domesticated animals and their wild relatives</p>	<p>Trends in area of agriculture under sustainable practices</p> <p><b>Trends in areas under ecologically based, diversified, resilient and sustainable production system</b></p> <p><b>A 25% target component on organic agriculture</b></p> <p>Trends in area of agriculture under sustainable <b>management</b></p>	<p>Proportion of land that is degraded over total land area (SDG indicator 15.3.1)</p> <p>Proportion of agricultural area under productive and sustainable agriculture (SDG indicator 2.4.1)</p> <p>Areas of agricultural land under conservation agriculture</p> <p><b>Areas under agroecological approaches, including agroforestry and other highly sustainable practices</b></p> <p><b>The area covered by agroecological approaches</b></p> <p><b>Areas under organic production</b> (FAOSTAT, it is an EU indicator for sustainable agriculture)</p> <p><b>Organic area share of total farmland in percentage per country</b> (indicator needs to deliver comparable data per country, harmonization of certification schemes important)</p> <p><b>Area of agriculture converted to organic farming</b></p> <p><b>Proportion of countries that have increased production and availability of food biodiversity with sustainable agricultural management practices</b></p>
	<p>Sustainable management of agricultural biodiversity, including soil biodiversity, <b>pollinators and other associated biodiversity</b>, cultivated plants and farmed and domesticated animals</p>	<p>Trends in soil quality</p>	<p><b>Proportion of land degradation by human activities</b></p> <p><b>Percentage of land under a pledge or commitment to improve soil quality</b> (ex: the IUCN's Bonn Challenge to restore 350 million hectares of degraded and deforested land by 2030 could be a good source of data)</p> <p><b>Agricultural soil quality</b> (soil organic C, soil biota diversity)</p> <p><b>Inverse of the Sustainable Nitrogen Management Index</b> (<a href="https://epi.yale.edu/">https://epi.yale.edu/</a>)</p>
		<p>Trends in pollinators</p>	<p>Red List Index (pollinating species)</p>



<i>Target 9 suggestions</i>	<i>Component suggestions</i>	<i>Monitoring element suggestions</i>	<i>Indicator suggestions</i>
<p>by 2030, related productivity gaps by [50%]</p> <p>By 2030, <b>transform food systems to ensure they contribute to biodiversity, human and planetary health and provide enough nutritious and culturally appropriate food for all people today and in the future, and, in particular:</b></p> <p><b>1. Ensure agriculture, fisheries and aquaculture production are fully sustainable and contribute to biodiversity by applying agroecological approaches to agriculture, that also ensure ecological connectivity, and the ecosystem approach to fisheries and aquaculture;</b></p> <p><b>2. Protect and support the recovery of agrobiodiversity, pollinators and organisms critical for soil fertility and soil health, and invest in large scale soil restoration and rehabilitation;</b></p> <p><b>3. Reduce by 50% food waste and post-harvest loss;</b></p> <p><b>4. Reduce by 50% the global footprint of diets and align human and planetary health.</b></p> <p>By 2030, <b>key sectors, including fisheries, agriculture, aquaculture and forestry, as well as others, are managed sustainably through an ecosystem-based approach</b></p> <p>By 2030, support the productivity, sustainability, and resilience of biodiversity in agricultural and other managed ecosystems through</p>	and their wild relatives	Trends in <b>abundance and variety of</b> pollinators	<p><b>Indices relating to farmland biodiversity, such as common bird and butterfly indices or others, where appropriate</b></p> <p><b>Percentage of missed potential yield due to lack of pollination</b></p>
		Trends in genetic diversity of cultivated plants and of wild relatives	Number of plant and animal genetic resources for food and agriculture secured in either medium- or long-term conservation facilities (SDG indicator 2.5.1)
		Trends in genetic diversity of domesticated animals and of wild relatives	<p>Proportion of local breeds classified as being at risk of extinction</p> <p><b>Comprehensiveness of conservation of socioeconomically as well as culturally valuable species</b> (this indicator is already included in the BIP/WCMC indicators document. Responsible is Alliance of Bioversity International and CIAT, and Crop Trust; more info in the link)</p> <p><b>Trait diversity of crops and livestock, especially climate related responses</b></p> <p><b>Level of production of indigenous/native food species, varieties and breeds</b></p> <p><b>Area of traditional farming methods where plant and animal genetic resources for food and agriculture are conserved in situ, including the FAO Globally Important Agricultural Heritage Systems</b></p>
		Trends in practice of sustainable and ecosystem-based agricultural approaches including agroforestry, hydroponics, and rooftop gardens	<p><b>Incentives and promotion policies of sustainable practices for small scale producers</b></p> <p><b>Trends in the quantity of chemical pesticides and fertilizers used per hectare (FAO and IFA statistics)</b></p> <p><b>Adoption rate of precision agriculture</b></p>
		Trends in “land use stewardship” that have a positive impact on biodiversity, such as crop	

<i>Target 9 suggestions</i>	<i>Component suggestions</i>	<i>Monitoring element suggestions</i>	<i>Indicator suggestions</i>
<p>conservation, <b>restoration</b>, sustainable use <b>and equitable governance</b> of such ecosystems, reducing productivity gaps by at least [50%]</p> <p>By 2030, support the productivity sustainability and resilience of biodiversity in <b>productive terrestrial and aquatic agricultural, aquaculture and other managed ecosystems</b> through conservation and sustainable use of such ecosystems reducing productivity gaps through sustainable practices by at least [50%]</p> <p><b>Research and development for sustainable management in agricultural, aquaculture and other managed ecosystems to ensure productivity, sustainability and resilience of biodiversity</b></p> <p>By 2030, support the productivity, sustainability and resilience of biodiversity in agricultural and other managed ecosystems through conservation and sustainable use of such ecosystems, <b>reducing food loss and waste by at least [50%].</b></p>		<b>rotation, use of cover crops, adoption of conservation tillage, and other measures supporting habitat for birds and insects such as hedges and flower strips</b>	
		<b>Trends in increased adoption of conservation tillage</b>	
		<b>Trends in pesticide use training for farmers</b>	
		<b>Change in trends in the use of natural pest controls</b>	<b>Application of integrated pest management</b> <b>Application of natural pest control or integrated pest management</b>
		<b>Trends in knowledge-sharing, including indigenous and local knowledge, on agricultural biodiversity and sustainable management</b>	
	<b>T9.2. Contribution of agricultural lands to the structural and/or functional ecological connectivity of natural ecosystems</b>	<b>To restore/provide 10-20% of area as natural habitat, down to small spatial scales of about 1 km<sup>2</sup></b>	<b>Areas of agricultural land applied landscape approaches</b>  <b>Health of populations of species that rely on diverse agricultural habitats</b> (i.e. mosaics of hedgerows, forest edges, diverse crops, small fields, uncultivated patches of land along field edges, vegetation along the sides of waterways etc.)  <b>Percentage of farms within highly productive landscapes that meet the 10% Space for Nature requirement (status and trend)</b>
	<b>T9.3. Restoration of agricultural damaged ecosystems, to</b>	<b>Area of restored agricultural land which was previously damaged/ low on productivity</b>	<b>Amount of degraded land restored as a percentage (%) of the total degraded agricultural area</b>

<i>Target 9 suggestions</i>	<i>Component suggestions</i>	<i>Monitoring element suggestions</i>	<i>Indicator suggestions</i>
	<b>increase productivity and avoid further land conversion of forests and other critical ecosystems</b>	<b>Reduce by at least [X%] the trend of change in the use of forest to agricultural land with respect to the current baseline.</b>  <b>10% target component for maintaining and restoring native vegetation within highly productive landscapes</b>	
	T9.4. Sustainable management of aquaculture	Trends in production of aquaculture under sustainable practices  <b>Decrease in rate of sea conversion into aquaculture, with the aim of decrease over time</b>	<b>Percentage of registered or licensed sustainable aquaculture companies of the private sector</b>
	T9.5. Sustainable management of all types of forests  <b>Sustainable management and trade of all types of forests and their genetic resources</b>	Trends in proportion of area of forests under sustainable practices  <b>Decrease in rate of land/forest conversion into agricultural land with the aim of decrease over time</b>	Progress towards sustainable forest management (SDG indicator 15.2.1)  <b>Number of certified forest areas under sustainable management with verified impacts on habitat conservation/ restoration</b>  <b>Proportion of commercial logging concessions under certified management</b> [preferably FSC, but at the limit PEFC])  <b>Proportion of total plantation forest domain under certified management</b> (type of certification: RSPO in the case of palm oil, FSC for timber)  <b>Dead wood</b> (commonly used to measure structural biodiversity in forests, and it could be used as a regional indicator at least in the boreal region to measure the quality of forest ecosystems (see Forest Europe, <a href="https://foresteurope.org/deadwood-2/">https://foresteurope.org/deadwood-2/</a> ))

<i>Target 9 suggestions</i>	<i>Component suggestions</i>	<i>Monitoring element suggestions</i>	<i>Indicator suggestions</i>
	<b>T9.6. Food loss along production and supply chains</b>		
	<b>T9.7. Food waste at the retail and consumer levels</b>		
	<b>T9.8. Customary sustainable use of agriculture, aquaculture and forests</b>	<p><b>Trends in the recognition of customary sustainable use of indigenous peoples in agriculture, aquaculture, and forests</b></p> <p><b>Trends in area under customary, indigenous and/or local practices</b></p> <p><b>Proportion of production areas in agriculture, aquaculture and forests using customary sustainable use</b></p>	<p><b>SDG indicator 1.4.2 land tenure: Proportion of total adult population with secure tenure rights to land, (a) with legally recognized documentation, and (b) who perceive their rights to land as secure, by sex and type of tenure</b></p> <p><b>Area of agricultural land where agrobiodiversity is conserved and sustainably managed by indigenous peoples and local communities</b></p> <p><b>Food security, nutrition and livelihoods of indigenous peoples and local communities</b></p> <p><b>Number of plant genetic resources conserved in community gene banks in situ</b></p> <p><b>Proportion of traditional knowledge over seeds preservation and utilization</b> (also considering that much of the seed knowledge is with women)</p> <p><b>An indicator disaggregating sustainable land use by sex</b></p> <p><b>SDG indicators 2.3, 2.4 and 2.5</b></p> <p><b>Number of countries with an improved set of institutions and strategies—including policies, guidelines, regulations and tools and programmes—aiming to generate decent rural employment, including for women and youth</b> (United Nations Decade of Family Farming indicator)</p> <p><b>Number of countries with action taken to enhance decent rural employment opportunities, entrepreneurship and skills development, especially</b></p>

<i>Target 9 suggestions</i>	<i>Component suggestions</i>	<i>Monitoring element suggestions</i>	<i>Indicator suggestions</i>
			<p><b>for youth</b> (United Nations Decade of Family Farming Indicator)</p> <p><b>Percentage of indigenous community members that participate and are employed in traditional and subsistence activities</b> (FAO)</p> <p><b>Trends in the practice of traditional occupations</b> (COP decision X.43)</p> <p><b>Trends in the practice and legal recognition of traditional agriculture</b></p> <p><b>Proportion of total agricultural population with ownership or secure rights over agricultural land, by sex; and (b) share of women among owners or rights-bearers of agricultural land, by type of tenure</b> (SDGs 5.a.1 (a))</p> <p><b>Trends in land-use change and land tenure in the traditional territories of indigenous peoples and local communities</b> (decision X/43)</p> <p><b>Cultural Well-being and Cultural Vitality – cultural vitality index for indigenous and local knowledge</b> [from the Arctic Social Development Index]</p> <p><b>Legal recognition of the traditional occupations of indigenous peoples</b> (e.g. hunting-gathering, shifting cultivation, pastoralism)</p> <p><b>Existence of special programmes to strengthen indigenous peoples' traditional occupations</b></p>
		<b>Proportion of population engaged in sustainable agricultural production</b>	<p><b>Average income of small-scale food producers, by sex and indigenous status</b> (SDG indicator 2.3.2)</p> <p><b>Possibility to perform traditional occupations</b> (such as pastoralism, hunting/gathering, shifting cultivation, fishing) without restrictions (from Indigenous Navigator)</p> <p><b>Number of countries where the legal framework (including customary law) incentivizes generational</b></p>

<i>Target 9 suggestions</i>	<i>Component suggestions</i>	<i>Monitoring element suggestions</i>	<i>Indicator suggestions</i>
			<p><b>turnover in agriculture</b> (UN Decade on Family Farming)</p> <p><b>Percent of indigenous peoples that participate in modern/non-traditional economic activities</b> (FAO)</p> <p><b>Percent of indigenous community economy generated through traditional subsistence activities</b> (Technical Workshop on Indigenous Peoples and Indicators of Well-Being)</p> <p><b>Number of indigenous peoples' academic institutions developing quantitative or qualitative data on biodiversity growth systems, including ecological economic institutions</b></p>
	<b>T9.9. Sustainable extraction of water, fossil fuels and other natural resources</b>	<b>Trends and impacts of diverting river water or groundwater on species and habitats</b>	<b>The number of endangered species affected by water diversion</b>

Table 4. Proposed changes to the draft monitoring framework for Target 13

<i>Target 13 suggestions</i>	<i>Component suggestions</i>	<i>Monitoring element suggestions</i>	<i>Indicator suggestions</i>
<p>By 2030, integrate biodiversity values into policies, regulations, planning, development processes, poverty reduction strategies and accounts at all levels, ensuring that biodiversity values are mainstreamed across all sectors and integrated into assessments of environmental impacts.</p> <p><b>By 2030, integrate biodiversity values into policies, regulations, planning, development processes, climate mitigation and adaptation strategies, poverty reduction strategies and accounts at all levels, ensuring that</b></p>	<p>T13.1. Biodiversity reflected in policies and planning at all levels</p> <p><b>Biological and cultural diversity</b> reflected in policies and planning at all levels</p> <p>Biodiversity <b>and indigenous peoples' culture</b> reflected in</p>	<p>Trends in integration of biodiversity and ecosystem service values into planning processes</p> <p>Trends in <b>effective</b> integration of biological <b>and cultural diversity</b> and ecosystem service values into <b>planning</b> processes</p>	<p>(a) Number of countries/<b>The proportion of the earth's land and sea surface area where the countries</b> that have established national targets in accordance with or similar to Aichi Biodiversity Target 2 of the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011–2020 in their national biodiversity strategy and action plans and the progress reported towards these targets; and (b) integration of biodiversity into national accounting and reporting systems, defined as implementation of the System of Environmental Economic Accounting (SDG indicator 15.9.1)</p> <p>Number of countries/<b>the proportion of the earth's land and sea surface area where the countries have effected</b> mechanisms in place to enhance policy</p>

<i>Target 13 suggestions</i>	<i>Component suggestions</i>	<i>Monitoring element suggestions</i>	<i>Indicator suggestions</i>
<p><b>explicit biodiversity values are mainstreamed across all sectors and integrated into assessments of environmental impacts, formally adopting and implementing an ecosystem approach with its ecological and human dimensions.</b></p> <p>By 2030, mainstreaming the values of biodiversity and ecosystem services shall be directed towards strengthening cooperation between government policies and intersectoral collaboration mechanisms for the conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity, in consistence with national policies, programmes and strategies, taking into account the objectives of the Convention on Biological Diversity and other international obligations.</p> <p>By 2030, (a) multiple biodiversity values and ecosystem services (ES)/nature contributions to people (NCP) to be fully reflected in national accounts, national planning and governmental decision-making and spending; (b) nature-based solutions and biodiversity-enhancing activities are supported.</p> <p>By 2030, integrate biodiversity values into policies, regulations, planning, development processes, poverty reduction strategies and accounts at all levels, ensuring that biodiversity values are mainstreamed across all sectors and</p>	<p>policies and planning at all levels</p>		<p>coherence of sustainable development (SDG indicator 17.14)</p> <p><b>Number of subnational governments, cities and other local authorities that have adopted and implemented strategies and actions plans for biodiversity, and that are regularly reporting on associated results to fulfil their commitments and reach their goals/targets, as well as those that have adopted and implemented laws, regulations, strategies, action plans, and policies for sustainable development.</b></p> <p><b>Number of organizations who have put greater emphasis on integrating biodiversity values into their policies, regulations, planning, development processes, poverty reduction strategies and accounts at all levels, ensuring that biodiversity values are mainstreamed across all sectors and integrated into assessments of environmental impacts.</b></p> <p><b>Number of financial targets focusing on biodiversity and ecosystem service values in national development budgets.</b></p> <p><b>Number of policies enhancing sustainable use of biodiversity.</b></p> <p><b>Number of countries that have integrated cultural values across biodiversity and development policies and planning.</b></p> <p><b>Number of countries that have integrated traditional knowledge and languages of indigenous peoples and local communities across educational systems.</b></p> <p><b>Numbers of countries utilising environmental fiscal reform.</b></p> <p><b>Numbers of countries with biodiversity criteria in departmental budget proposals.</b></p>

<i>Target 13 suggestions</i>	<i>Component suggestions</i>	<i>Monitoring element suggestions</i>	<i>Indicator suggestions</i>
<p>integrated into assessments of environmental impacts <b>to ensure biodiversity conservation, sustainable use and benefit-sharing.</b></p> <p>By 2030, integrate biodiversity values, <b>sustainable use and equitable benefit sharing</b> into policies, regulations, planning, development processes, poverty reduction strategies and accounts at all levels, ensuring that biodiversity values are mainstreamed across all sectors and integrated into assessments of environmental impacts.</p> <p>By 2030, <b>fully</b> integrate biodiversity in <b>all global, regional, national, subnational and local planning and development processes, ensuring that all health, poverty reduction, climate and sectoral plans, strategies, policies, programmes and actions avoid negative and contribute to positive biodiversity impacts and unlock the full potential of nature-based solutions.</b></p> <p><b>X% of national, subnational and local planning development processes, policies, and reporting systems integrate/mainstream biodiversity values.</b></p> <p>By 2030, integrate <b>biological and cultural diversity values</b> into policies, regulations, planning, development processes, poverty reduction strategies</p>			<p><b>Number of countries whose legal framework, including customary law, does not guarantee women's and indigenous peoples' equal rights to land ownership and/or control.</b></p> <p><b>Trends in reviewing and updating of legal frameworks, policies and practices to promote the mainstreaming of biological diversity in productive sectors, socioeconomic and business policies and planning, through incentives for best practices in supply chains, sustainable production and consumption, including monitoring and oversight measures</b> (as indicated in decision 14/3).</p> <p><b>Accountability and long-term compliance mechanisms put in place for governments with regard to serious or irreversible damage to biodiversity.</b></p> <p><b>Number of countries systematically incorporating risk assessment and risk management carried out by independent experts in development projects.</b></p> <p><b>Number of governments / subnational governments (a) with public procurement policies and action plans for achieving at least no net loss or net gain of biodiversity and (b) achieving at least no net loss or net gain of biodiversity through these policies and plans.</b></p>
		<p>Trends in integration of biodiversity and ecosystem service values into development processes.</p> <p>Trends in integration of biodiversity, ecosystem service values <b>and cultural values</b> into development processes.</p>	<p><b>Number of countries with mechanisms in place to enhance policy coherence of sustainable development</b> (SDG indicator 17.14)</p> <p><b>Number of financial resources devoted to environmental programmes.</b></p> <p><b>Number of officials trained in economic valuation of forest biodiversity and forest ecosystems annually under international funding.</b></p>



<i>Target 13 suggestions</i>	<i>Component suggestions</i>	<i>Monitoring element suggestions</i>	<i>Indicator suggestions</i>
<p>and accounts at all levels, ensuring that biodiversity values are mainstreamed across all sectors and integrated into assessments of environmental <b>and social impacts, with the meaningful, informed, and effective participation of relevant stakeholders.</b></p> <p>By 2030, integrate biodiversity values policies, regulations, planning, development processes, poverty reduction strategies and accounts at all levels, <b>with mechanisms in place by 2025</b>, ensuring that biodiversity values are mainstreamed across all sectors <b>and that biodiversity-inclusive strategic environmental assessments and environmental impact assessments using a conservation-enabling hierarchy approach, are comprehensively applied.</b></p>			<p><b>Number of trade, financial agreements that include human rights dispute mechanisms, tied to international instruments.</b></p> <p><b>Number of trade, financial agreements that incentivize global biodiversity framework performance with privileges.</b></p>
		Trends in integration of biodiversity and ecosystem service values into poverty reduction strategies	<p><b>Number of poverty reduction strategies that incorporate sustainable use of biodiversity as a means to poverty reduction and poverty reduction as a means for reducing over exploitation.</b></p> <p><b>Ratio of the number of countries which have included biodiversity and ecosystem service values into their poverty reduction strategies over the number of countries which have a poverty reduction strategy.</b></p>
		Trends in integration of biodiversity and ecosystem service values into sectoral plans	<p><b>Number of countries that have established action plans, national strategies or related initiatives to develop a sustainable bioeconomy.</b></p> <p><b>Number of private companies taking action to account for and take action on the degree to which their actions and policies affect and/or seek to improve effects on biodiversity/transition to sustainable use.</b></p> <p><b>Number of countries with mechanism in place to promote private entities' integration of biodiversity positive policies/practices, and have provided avenues by which this is enabled.</b></p> <p><b>The number of references to biodiversity in national policies of non-environment sectors.</b></p> <p><b>Number of sector-wide policies in place for achieving no net loss or net gain of biodiversity.</b></p> <p><b>Number of sector-specific and inclusive national, regional and global plans of action for food and agriculture, forestry, fisheries, infrastructure and</b></p>

<i>Target 13 suggestions</i>	<i>Component suggestions</i>	<i>Monitoring element suggestions</i>	<i>Indicator suggestions</i>
			<p><b>energy, extractives, and manufacturing developed and implemented.</b></p> <p><b>Number of countries which have integrated biodiversity and ecosystem service values into any sectoral plan.</b></p>
		<b>Trends in the benefits from the access to genetic resources shared</b>	<b>Number of contracts signed including monetary and non-monetary benefits to providers of genetic resources.</b>
		<b>Trends in use of traditional knowledge associated with genetic resources</b>	<b>Number of contracts with PIC signed and benefits participation related on traditional knowledge associated biological resources that contain the genetic resources.</b>
		<b>Trends in benefits generated and shared from the use of traditional knowledge associated with genetic resources</b>	<b>Number of contracts with PIC signed and monetary and non-monetary benefits participation related on traditional knowledge associated biological resources that contain the genetic resources.</b>
		<b>Trends in tools and platforms that incorporate biodiversity considerations</b>	
		<b>Trends in the engagement of stakeholders for mainstreaming biodiversity and ecosystem service values into policies, national accounts and regulatory frameworks to ensure the sustainable use of biological diversity</b>	
		<b>Trends in the integration of diverse ecological and social well-being measures of success and development alongside GDP/economic growth</b>	<p><b>Number of countries using measures of success other than GDP that focus ecological and social well-being.</b></p> <p><b>Number of new economic models that recognize, respect and integrate biological and cultural diversity values in the revalorization processes in the face of COVID 19 and the aim of “build back better”.</b></p>

<i>Target 13 suggestions</i>	<i>Component suggestions</i>	<i>Monitoring element suggestions</i>	<i>Indicator suggestions</i>
	T13.2. Biodiversity reflected in national and other accounts	<p>Trends in integration of biodiversity and ecosystem service values into national accounts.</p> <p><b>Biodiversity reflected in national accounts</b></p>	<p>(a) Number of countries that have established national targets in accordance with or similar to Aichi Biodiversity Target 2 of the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011–2020 in their national biodiversity strategy and action plans and the progress reported towards these targets; and (b) integration of biodiversity into national accounting and reporting systems, defined as implementation of the System of Environmental Economic Accounting15.9.1).</p> <p><b>Number of countries incorporating integrated landscape approaches to biodiversity and human well-being into national biodiversity strategies and action plans (NBSAPs) and other national policies is being researched and monitored through a joint project by UNU-IAS and SCBD with other partners.</b></p> <p><b>Number of countries that have mainstreamed biodiversity for food and nutrition into relevant national development strategies and plans including NBSAPs, multisectoral nutrition plans, national agricultural plans, national climate change adaptation programmes of action (NAPAs) and national climate change adaptation plans (NAPs) and other relevant national development strategies and plans.</b></p> <p><b>Number of countries implementing the Voluntary Guidelines on Mainstreaming Biodiversity into Policies, Programmes and National and Regional Plans of Action on Nutrition and Voluntary Guidelines on Food Systems and Nutrition (to be endorsed by CFS in 2020), as well as other relevant instruments, tools and voluntary guidelines for transforming food systems.</b></p> <p><b>Number of countries that have established national targets in their NBSAPs that is fully reflective of</b></p>

<i>Target 13 suggestions</i>	<i>Component suggestions</i>	<i>Monitoring element suggestions</i>	<i>Indicator suggestions</i>
			<p>gender considerations, and addressed in national reporting.</p> <p>Number of NBSAPs that contain programmes or projects that promote cultural and biological diversity values</p> <p>Number of NBSAPs that contain programmes or projects that support community-based monitoring and information systems (CBMIS) and recognize community protocols.</p> <p>Numbers of countries employing systems of environmental accounts.</p>
		<p>Trends in integration of biodiversity and ecosystem service values into other accounts</p> <p><b>Trends in integration of biodiversity and ecosystem values into other accounts, including in the private sector</b></p>	<p>Number of companies or organizations which include information on biodiversity as part of their annual reporting.</p> <p>Number of financial institutions using biodiversity metrics to guide investment and risk management.</p> <p>Number of countries having adopted a harmonized National Tariff Line nomenclature for biodiversity-based products.</p>
		<b>Trends in businesses that use corporate natural capital accounting</b>	
	T13.3. Biodiversity values are reflected in policies and regulations, including on biodiversity inclusive environmental impact assessments and strategic	<p>Trends in the number of policies and regulations which incorporate biodiversity considerations</p> <p>Trends in the number of policies and regulations which incorporate biodiversity <b>and related cultural</b> considerations</p>	<p>Number of States that recognize indigenous knowledge in legislation, regulations, and policies.</p> <p>Number of States that have implement the key principles from the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples.</p> <p>Number of countries applying the Akwé: Kon Guidelines.</p> <p>Mechanisms established to ensure effective and meaningful participation of all relevant stakeholders</p>

<i>Target 13 suggestions</i>	<i>Component suggestions</i>	<i>Monitoring element suggestions</i>	<i>Indicator suggestions</i>
	<p>environmental assessments.</p> <p>Biodiversity values <b>and related cultural values</b> are reflected in policies and regulations, including on biodiversity inclusive environmental impact assessments and strategic environmental assessments.</p> <p><b>Biodiversity values are reflected in environmental impact assessments and strategic environmental assets.</b></p>	<p>Trends in effective integration of biological and cultural diversity and ecosystem service values into development processes</p>	<p><b>including children and youth in EIA processes and free prior informed consent processes.</b></p> <p><b>Incentives for culturally appropriate and sustainable practices: Promote the integration of biodiversity protection measures by promoting fiscal instruments with economic benefits for those who adopt practices in benefit of cultural and biological diversity.</b></p> <p><b>Compliance with safeguard systems that comply with the minimum standards set by international human rights law.</b></p> <p><b>Number of youth and women engaged through capacity-building programmes on EIA processes and their implications and related rights.</b></p> <p><b>Social, spiritual, cultural and environmental impact assessments are undertaken prior to approval of projects that may affect indigenous peoples' lands, territories or resources, with the participation of indigenous peoples' representative institutions.</b></p> <p><b>The number of countries that have incorporated the BioTrade Principles and Criteria.</b></p> <p><b>Number of countries that have trade, export or other related strategies that foster the sustainable trade of biodiversity-based products and services, such as BioTrade</b></p>
		<p>Trends in the number of policies and regulations on environmental impact assessment which incorporate biodiversity considerations</p> <p><b>Trends in the incorporation of biodiversity considerations</b></p>	<p><b>Number of countries which incorporate biodiversity considerations into environmental impact assessments</b></p>

<i>Target 13 suggestions</i>	<i>Component suggestions</i>	<i>Monitoring element suggestions</i>	<i>Indicator suggestions</i>
		<b>into environmental impact assessment</b>	
		Trends in the number of policies and regulations requiring the use of strategic environmental impact assessment which incorporate biodiversity considerations	<b>Proportion of national territory covered by current biodiversity-inclusive strategic environmental assessment (or equivalent comprehensive spatial planning) using a conservation-enabling hierarchy approach.</b>
	<b>Nature-based solutions are being applied to address societal challenges</b>	<b>Trends in countries applying nature-based solutions to societal challenges including climate change, disaster risk management, water security, food security, human health and development</b>	<b>Number and monetary value of projects adhering to the IUCN Global Standard for Nature-based solutions, by country</b>

**Table 5. Proposed changes to the draft monitoring framework for Target 15**

<i>Target 15 suggestions</i>	<i>Component suggestions</i>	<i>Monitoring element suggestions</i>	<i>Indicator suggestions</i>
<p>By 2030, eliminate unsustainable consumption patterns, ensuring people everywhere understand and appreciate the value of biodiversity, make responsible choices commensurate with 2050 biodiversity vision, taking into account individual and national cultural and socioeconomic conditions.</p> <p>By 2030, <b>ensure people everywhere understand and appreciate the value of biodiversity, which will motivate to eliminate unsustainable consumption</b></p>	<p>T15.1. Sustainable consumption patterns</p> <p><b>Minimizing of impact of consumption including private consumption, public procurement and supply chains on biodiversity</b></p>	<p>Trends in use of non-renewable natural resources</p>	<p>Material footprint, material footprint per capita, and material footprint per GDP (SDG indicators 8.4.1 and 12.2.1)</p> <p>Number of countries/<b>Proportion of the world's surface</b> developing, adopting or implementing policy instruments aimed at supporting the shift to sustainable consumption and production (SDG indicator 12.1.1).</p> <p><b>Percent of the human population changing their behaviour.</b></p> <p>Domestic material consumption, domestic material consumption per capita, and domestic material consumption per GDP (SDG indicators 8.4.2 and 12.2.2).</p>

<i>Target 15 suggestions</i>	<i>Component suggestions</i>	<i>Monitoring element suggestions</i>	<i>Indicator suggestions</i>
<p>patterns, and make responsible choices commensurate with 2050 biodiversity vision, taking into account individual and national cultural and socioeconomic conditions.</p> <p><b>Governments take measurable steps towards sustainable consumption and lifestyles, putting in place measures to ensure consumption and trade are not taking place at the expense of biodiversity, that resource use is within equitable global and regional ecological boundaries, taking into account individual and national cultural and socioeconomic conditions, achieving by 2030 just and sustainable consumption levels.</b></p> <p>By 2030, improve by at least 50% the sustainability of currently unsustainable consumption patterns, ensuring people everywhere understand and appreciate the value of biodiversity, make responsible choices commensurate with 2050 biodiversity vision, taking into account individual and national cultural and socioeconomic conditions.</p> <p><b>Appropriate measures, including, if necessary, a combination of fiscal and regulatory measures are put in place to promote biodiversity conservation through sustainable consumption, production and lifestyles, taking into account individual and national cultural and socioeconomic conditions, in order</b></p>			<p>Domestic material consumption, domestic material consumption per capita, and domestic material consumption per GDP (SDG indicators 8.4.2 and 12.2.2).</p> <p>National recycling rate, tons of material recycled (SDG indicator 12.5.1).</p> <p><b>Number of countries with green procurement legislation.</b></p>
		Trends in use of renewable natural resources	<p>(a) Food loss index and (b) food waste index (SDG indicator 12.3.1).</p> <p>Level of water stress: freshwater withdrawal as a proportion of available freshwater resources (SDG indicator 6.4.2).</p> <p><b>Proportion of population with primary reliance on clean fuels and technology, by main user disaggregated by sex.</b></p>
		<p>Trends in use of biological resources</p> <p><b>Trends in use of biological resources by biodiversity sectors that directly or indirectly depend on biodiversity for their economic development</b></p> <p><b>Trends in unsustainable use of biological resources</b></p>	<p><b>Number of countries financing research projects or such on sustainable production.</b></p> <p><b>Number of biological resources with green certification in the market.</b></p> <p><b>Increase/decrease of the area under organic agriculture to be updated biennially.</b></p> <p><b>Facilitating mechanisms put in place by each country for promoting organic agriculture.</b></p> <p><b>Increase/decrease in the number of people consuming organically grown foodstuff, including milk and milk products, grains and meat etc.</b></p> <p><b>Proportion of fish stocks underfished, fully fished and overfished (FAO SOFIA reports).</b></p> <p><b>Kg of meat consumption per capita (Baseline Data from FAO).</b></p>

<i>Target 15 suggestions</i>	<i>Component suggestions</i>	<i>Monitoring element suggestions</i>	<i>Indicator suggestions</i>
<p><b>to attain by 2030 sustainable consumption and production levels.</b></p> <p><b>75% of countries in “middle” and “higher” consumption clusters should ensure at least 75% of their OECD Domestic Material Consumption (DMC) values come from sustainable sources, by 2030.</b></p> <p><b>Promote, including through education, environmentally responsible visions of a good quality of life to encourage behavioural change towards sustainable consumption and lifestyles.</b></p> <p>By 2030, eliminate unsustainable consumption patterns <b>linked to biodiversity loss</b>, ensuring people everywhere understand and appreciate the value of biodiversity, make responsible choices commensurate with 2050 biodiversity vision, taking into account individual and national cultural and socioeconomic conditions.</p> <p>By 2030, eliminate unsustainable consumption patterns, make responsible choices commensurate with 2050 biodiversity vision, taking into account individual and national cultural and socioeconomic conditions.</p> <p>By 2030, <b>the total material consumption (minerals, metals and non-metals) per capita converges to a sustainable level in line with ecological boundaries.</b></p> <p>Infrastructure-sector-specific:</p>			<b>The conservation status of species targeted for consumptive uses (direct use or sale/trade)</b>
		Trends in ecological limits reached or surpassed	Ecological Footprint.  Domestic material consumption, domestic material consumption per capita, and domestic material consumption per GDP (SDG indicators 8.4.2 and 12.2.2).
		<b>Reduction of production of waste and residues</b>	
		<b>Trends in the establishment of payment for environmental services schemes connecting consumers to the maintenance of the sustainable use of biodiversity</b>	
		<b>Balancing/redressing past impacts on biodiversity, sustainable use and benefit-sharing</b>	
		<b>Trends in capacity to prevent over-consumption of non-renewable natural resources</b>	
		<b>Trends in tools and resources developed for policymakers, businesses and civil society to uptake sustainable lifestyles that address global challenges such as biodiversity conservation, resource efficiency, climate change mitigation, poverty reduction, supply chains, sustainable production and</b>	<b>Change in the number of business initiatives (or public-private partnerships) that encourage sustainable consumption and consumer behavioural change.</b>



<i>Target 15 suggestions</i>	<i>Component suggestions</i>	<i>Monitoring element suggestions</i>	<i>Indicator suggestions</i>
<p><b>By 2030, ensure infrastructure and urban development minimizes impacts on areas of particular importance for biodiversity and ecosystem service, and maximizes climate resilience, by prioritizing the use and improvement of existing infrastructure and nature-based solutions, and applying strategic environmental impact assessment and land- and sea-scape planning.</b></p> <p>Finance-sector-specific:</p> <p><b>By 2030, develop, implement and enforce regulatory measures on national and, where relevant, regional and global level to align public and private financial flows with the three objectives of the Convention.</b></p> <p>By 2030, (i) eliminate unsustainable consumption patterns, (ii) ensure people everywhere understand and appreciate the value of biodiversity, make responsible choices commensurate with 2050 biodiversity vision, taking into account individual and national cultural and socioeconomic conditions.</p> <p>By 2030, eliminate unsustainable consumption and production patterns, <b>ensuring civil society, public and private sectors everywhere understand and appreciate</b> the value of biodiversity, make responsible choices commensurate with 2050 biodiversity vision, taking into account individual and national cultural and socioeconomic conditions.</p>	<p>T15.2. New vision of good quality of life based on sustainability and new social norms for sustainability</p> <p><b>New vision of good quality of life based on sustainability and new social norms for biodiversity value and integration</b></p> <p>New vision of good quality of life based on new social norms for sustainability, <b>equity and biodiversity values integration</b></p>	<p><b>consumption, and social well-being</b></p> <p>Trends in public engagement and attitudes towards biodiversity</p>	<p>Biodiversity Engagement Indicator</p> <p>Biodiversity Barometer</p> <p>WAZA bio-literacy survey (Biodiversity literacy in global zoo and aquarium visitors)</p> <p><b>Trends in the integration of transformative education on biological and cultural diversity, languages, sustainability and heritage into school curricula at all levels and in higher education programmes.</b></p> <p><b>Trends in the implementation of educational methods that focus on reconnection with nature through learning-by-doing and experiencing nature.</b></p> <p><b>Trends in research that explore sustainability pathways and scenarios and economic de-growth.</b></p> <p><b>Number of countries that develop or use new development indicators that focus on well-being rather than on economic profit.</b></p> <p><b>Trends in diversification of primary and secondary education curricula in accordance with indigenous peoples' cultural and linguistic characteristics within the national education framework (from the Indigenous Navigator).</b></p> <p><b>Extent to which (i) {culturally appropriate biodiversity and heritage education} and (ii) education for sustainable development, including gender equality and human rights, are mainstreamed at all levels in (a) national education policies; (b) curricula; (c) teacher education; and (d) student assessment (Adopted from SDG Indicator 4.7.1).</b></p> <p><b>Change in consumer awareness and behaviour change towards responsible consumption practices.</b></p>

<i>Target 15 suggestions</i>	<i>Component suggestions</i>	<i>Monitoring element suggestions</i>	<i>Indicator suggestions</i>
<p><b>By 2030, transformative education on biological and cultural diversity, languages, sustainability and heritage is integrated into school curricula at all levels and in higher education, programmes as well as promoted in informal education, with a strong focus on reconnection with nature through learning-by-doing and experiencing nature.</b></p> <p>By 2030, eliminate unsustainable <b>and unfair production</b>, consumption, <b>trade, distribution, and disposal</b> patterns, ensuring people everywhere understand and appreciate the value of biodiversity, make responsible choices commensurate with 2050 biodiversity vision, taking into account <b>intergenerational equity and</b> individual and national cultural and socioeconomic conditions.</p> <p>By 2030, <b>promote sustainable consumption patterns by ensuring understanding and appreciation of</b> the value of biodiversity and responsible choices commensurate with 2050 biodiversity vision, taking into account national cultural and socioeconomic conditions.</p> <p>By 2030, eliminate unsustainable consumption patterns <b>and lifestyle, and take measurable steps by 2025</b>, ensuring that people, <b>industries, retailers, financial institutions and governments</b> understand and appreciate the value of biodiversity, make</p>			Annual research processes by leading market research firms (Nielsen, Globescan, Kantar and Ipsos all do surveys), identifying shifts in (a) awareness of, and attitudes towards, sustainable consumption choices and (b) self-reported purchase rates and intention.
		Trends in government engagement and attitudes towards biodiversity conservation	<p>Number of subnational governments, cities and other local authorities that have developed, adopted and implemented policy instruments aimed at supporting the shift to sustainable consumption and production, and that are regularly reporting on results associated with their implementation.</p> <p>Number of governments that develop awareness campaigns about sustainable consumption patterns.</p>
		Trends in national policies and programmes that mainstream Biodiversity-based Products	
	T15.3. Peoples' responsibility for their choices	<p>Trends in demand for more environmentally friendly products.</p> <p>Trends in demand <b>and access</b> to more environmentally friendly products <b>and support mechanisms for small-scale producers of organic and sustainable products.</b></p> <p>Trends in demand for more <b>products which are produced in a biodiversity friendly way</b></p>	<p><b>Number of biological resources with green labels in the market.</b></p> <p><b>Increase in the consumption of these products and the relationship between sustainable and non-sustainable products.</b></p> <p><b>Trends of exports in biodiversity-based products.</b></p>
		Trends in consumption of diverse locally produced food	Number of new markets developed for food biodiverse products with high nutritional value, including more food

<i>Target 15 suggestions</i>	<i>Component suggestions</i>	<i>Monitoring element suggestions</i>	<i>Indicator suggestions</i>
<p>responsible choices commensurate with 2050 biodiversity vision, taking into account individual and national cultural and socioeconomic conditions.</p> <p>By 2030, ensure that people everywhere <b>have the relevant information and awareness for sustainable development and lifestyles in harmony with nature.</b></p>			<p><b>nutritious convenience foods based on biodiverse products.</b></p> <p><b>Demand for more ethically produced meat.</b></p> <p><b>Number of people trained to deploy and benefit from nutritionally rich biodiversity.</b></p> <p><b>Number of countries that have in place national food-based dietary guidelines which highlight the importance of food biodiversity not only for healthy diets and nutrition outcomes but also the many other multiple benefits, including environmental sustainability and social equity.</b></p>
		<b>Trends in demand for fair trade products derived from biodiversity</b>	<b>Increase in the availability and sales of wild-harvested products independently verified as meeting the legality and sustainability requirements</b> (measured by the availability of e.g. FairWild-certified products, FSC-certified products, MSC-certified products, etc.)
		<b>Trends in disuse of high-risk products to biodiversity</b>	<p><b>National income generated by products with environmentally friendly labelling (vegan, organic, ethical, sustainable) that conform with environmental and social safeguards.</b></p> <p><b>Trends in use or consumption of effective certified sustainably produced or managed resources.</b></p>
		<b>Trends in biodiversity-based including organic products</b>	
	<b>T15.4</b>	<b>Trends in development and adoption of measures to respect the rights of indigenous peoples and local communities to reject LMOs on their lands and territories.</b>	<p><b>People's rights to use lands, waters and forests primarily by customary sustainable ways empowered to prevent their non-renewable over-consumption in terms of material footprint per capita/GDP.</b></p> <p><b>People's rights to customary sustainable use of biodiverse ecosystems strengthened to prevent ecological limits surpassed in terms of material consumption per capita/GDP.</b></p>

<i>Target 15 suggestions</i>	<i>Component suggestions</i>	<i>Monitoring element suggestions</i>	<i>Indicator suggestions</i>
			<p><b>The number of times assistance is given to indigenous peoples' governments to monitor, report, inspect, investigate, prosecute supply chains.</b></p> <p><b>The impact of indigenous peoples' academic institutions on reducing biodiversity loss as direct result of study, research, and development on supply chains and their effective monitoring and regulation.</b></p> <p><b>Recognition of the state duty to consult with indigenous peoples before adopting or implementing legislative or administrative measures that may affect them and prior to approval of any project that affects their lands, territories and resources in national legislation (from Indigenous Navigator).</b></p> <p><b>Number of countries that have set national targets on the number of public policies and regulations on environmental and cultural impact assessment adopted through the full and effective participation of indigenous peoples and local communities.</b></p> <p><b>Social, spiritual, cultural and environmental impact assessments are undertaken prior to approval of projects that may affect indigenous peoples' lands, territories or resources, with the participation of indigenous peoples' representative institutions' (from Indigenous Navigator).</b></p>
	<b>T15.5 Reduction of meat and dairy consumption worldwide</b>		<b>Amount of per-capita consumption of animal protein [potentially split into meat and dairy consumption] and fish, status and trends</b>

*Annex IV*

**ONLINE SURVEY QUESTIONS**

*Section I. Sustainable use of biological diversity in the post-2020 global biodiversity framework*

1. Do the draft goals and targets of the framework adequately incorporate all the considerations of the sustainable use of biological diversity, as defined by the Convention?
  - a. What are the strengths in this regard? (Or What works?)
  - b. What are the gaps in this regard? (Or What doesn't work?)
  - c. What needs to be changed?
2. Does the draft monitoring framework for the post-2020 global biodiversity framework (i.e. current goals, milestones, targets, components of the targets, monitoring elements and indicators) incorporate the sustainable use of biological diversity in a balanced way? What changes would you suggest to better reflect the sustainable use of biodiversity in the framework in a more balanced way?
3. Do the current Goals and milestones fully reflect the sustainable use of biological diversity? Please consider specific suggestions on Goals and milestones.

*Section II. Sustainable use of biological diversity in the targets of the draft monitoring framework for the post-2020 global biodiversity framework*

4. Can the current targets ensure the sustainable use of biological diversity? Please consider specific suggestions on targets. Target 4 aims to reduce threats to biodiversity from overexploitation by ensuring that biological resources are used, harvested and traded sustainably. What needs to be changed, added or deleted to address overexploitation challenges? Please consider specific suggestions on components of the target, monitoring elements, indicators and baselines.
5. How can the benefits arising from use of wild species of fauna and flora, such as nutrition, food security, livelihoods, health and well-being, be achieved without compromising long term sustainability of biological diversity?
6. Changes in land and sea use are some of the main drivers of biodiversity loss, what should be the main objective of this target to ensure that the sustainable use of biodiversity can continue to support the productivity of agricultural and other managed ecosystems? Please consider specific suggestions on components of the target, monitoring elements, indicators and baselines.
7. Mainstreaming is an enabling tool to ensure the sustainable use of biological diversity, as well as the other objectives of the Convention, and will be the object of the complementary long-term approach on this issue currently under development with an informal advisory group. What specific actions are needed to mainstream biodiversity and ecosystem service values into policies, national accounts and regulatory frameworks to ensure the sustainable use of biological diversity? How can these be reflected in the target? Please consider specific suggestions on components of the target, monitoring elements, indicators and baselines.
8. Changes towards sustainable production and consumption will be critical to ensure the sustainable use of biological diversity. Is the target specific enough to ensure these changes and to promote the sustainable use of biodiversity? Please consider specific suggestions on components of the target, monitoring elements, indicators and baselines.
9. Other targets of the framework directly or indirectly support the sustainable use of biological diversity. Please indicate what other targets should also incorporate a component related to sustainable use and what should this component be? Please name the target and describe the component you would like to suggest.

*Section III. Customary sustainable use in the draft post-2020 global biodiversity framework*

10. How can the global biodiversity framework harness customary sustainable use by indigenous, local or traditional communities, as a strategy to achieve the goals of the Convention?
11. Is customary sustainable use currently used as a strategy in conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity? Is CSU implemented through policies and/or projects? Please elaborate.
12. What are the traditional occupations/livelihoods dependant on biodiversity that are unique to your country and what are the trends in those activities, including their intergenerational transfer? Please specify whether sex-disaggregated data exists and include one or two examples if possible. How can the global biodiversity framework recognize and protect those activities?

*Annex V*

**ONLINE DISCUSSION FORUM QUESTIONS**

*Thread 1. Sustainable harvest, trade and use of biological diversity*

1. Which terms should be used in Target 4: ‘wildlife’, ‘wild species’ or ‘biological resources’? What would the implications of these different terms be for the monitoring framework of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework?
2. Would it be more effective to monitor trends in illegal trade and harvesting, in addition to trends in legal trade and harvesting?
3. What indicators could be used in the monitoring framework to ensure the safety of sustainable use?
4. What techniques currently exist to estimate sustainable harvest, trade or use limits and quotas?

*Thread 2. Ensuring benefits to people through sustainable use*

1. Why is it important for the post-2020 global biodiversity framework to ensure nature’s benefits to people and not just sustainable use?
2. Are there benefits to people, other than food and medicine, that the post-2020 global biodiversity framework should monitor in Target 8?
3. One of the aims of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework is to ensure the sustainable use of biological diversity, should it monitor activities that ensure benefits to people through sustainable use?

*Thread 3. Sustainable use of biological diversity across sectors*

1. How can un/sustainable consumption and production be measured to ensure the sustainable use of biodiversity across sectors? What would be the implications for the monitoring framework of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework?
2. How can the monitoring framework of the global biodiversity framework better integrate productive sectors to ensure and promote the sustainable use of biological diversity? What would the implications be for the monitoring framework of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework?
3. How can the framework monitor progress of ‘ensuring people everywhere understand and appreciate the value of biodiversity’, taking into account ‘individual and national cultural and socioeconomic conditions’?

*Thread 4. Customary sustainable use*

1. How can customary sustainable use be strengthened, protected and encouraged in the global biodiversity framework?
2. How can issues related to land tenure, joint management of protected areas or indigenous peoples and local communities conserved territories, and secure access to terrestrial, fresh water, and marine flora and fauna be integrated into the global biodiversity framework?
3. What milestone, component, monitoring element or indicator could be strengthened in the global biodiversity framework for customary sustainable use monitoring? What would the implications be for the monitoring framework of the global biodiversity framework?

*Annex VI*

**LIST OF PARTIES AND ORGANIZATIONS REGISTERED FOR THE CONSULTATION**

**A. Parties to the Convention**

Algeria	Egypt	Nigeria
Andorra	Equatorial Guinea	Norway
Angola	European Union	Peru
Antigua and Barbuda	Finland	Portugal
Argentina	France	Republic of Korea
Armenia	Georgia	Russia Federation
Australia	Germany	Serbia
Bahamas	Ghana	Slovenia
Bangladesh	Grenada	Somalia
Belarus	Guyana	South Africa
Benin	India	Spain
Bosnia and Herzegovina	Iran (Islamic Republic of)	Sri Lanka
Botswana	Israel	Sudan
Brazil	Côte d'Ivoire	Suriname
Canada	Jamaica	Sweden
Chile	Japan	Switzerland
China	Liberia	Syria
Colombia	Madagascar	Togo
Comoros	Malawi	Trinidad and Tobago
Costa Rica	Malaysia	United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland
Croatia	Maldives	
Cuba	Mexico	
Democratic Republic of the Congo	Namibia	Uruguay
Dominican Republic	Netherlands	Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of)
Ecuador	New Zealand	Zimbabwe
	Niger	

The following State not party to the Convention was also represented: United States of America.

**B. Secretariat units, programmes and specialized agencies of the United Nations, conventions and other agreements**

Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species of Wild Fauna and Flora	United Nations Development Programme
Convention on the Conservation on Migratory Species of Wild Animals	United Nations Environment Programme – Regional Activity Centre for Specially Protected Areas
Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations	United Nations Environment Programme - World Conservation Monitoring Centre
Intergovernmental Science-Policy Platform on Biodiversity and Ecosystem Services	United Nations Industrial Development Organization
Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights	United Nations Office of Legal Affairs
Secretariat of the Basel, Rotterdam and Stockholm Conventions	United Nations University Institute for the Advanced Study of Sustainability
United Nations Conference on Trade and Development	World Trade Organization



### **C. Intergovernmental organizations**

African Union  
African Union Development Agency  
Association of Southeast Asian Nations  
Bay of Bengal Programme  
Center for International Forestry Research  
CGIAR  
International Coral Reef Initiative  
International Council for Game and Wildlife  
Conservation  
International Seabed Authority  
International Tropical Timber Organization  
International Union for the Protection of New  
Varieties of Plants

International Union for Conservation of Nature  
IUCN CPW  
IUCN Fisheries Expert Group  
North East Atlantic Fisheries Commission  
Post2020 Biodiversity Framework EU Support  
Ramsar Convention on Wetlands  
Red de Cooperación Amazónica  
Regions4 Sustainable Development  
Secretariat of International Partnership for the  
Satoyama Initiative  
World Agroforestry

### **D. Academic**

African Wildlife Economy Institute  
Ghent University  
Grotius Centre for International Legal Studies,  
Leiden University  
Helmholtz Centre for Environmental Research  
(UFZ)  
Institut de Recherches Halieutiques et  
Océanologiques du Bénin  
Institute for Advanced Sustainability Studies  
Instituto Alexander von Humboldt  
International University Network on Cultural  
and Biological Diversity  
Marine and Coastal Research Institute  
(INVEMAR)  
Mid Sweden University  
Nanjing Institute for Environment Technology

Nanjing Institute of Environmental Sciences  
National University of Tumbes  
Natural History Museum and Botanical Garden  
of Federal University of Minas Gerais  
SLU Swedish Biodiversity Centre, Swedish  
University of Agricultural Sciences  
South African National Biodiversity Institute  
S. P. Jain Institute of Management and Research  
(SPJIMR)  
South African National Biodiversity Institute  
Universidad Científica del Sur, Lima, Peru  
Universidad de La Salle  
University of Brasilia  
University of Mostar  
University of Puerto Rico-Rio Piedras  
University of São Paulo

### **E. Indigenous groups**

Assembly of First Nations, Canada  
Barnes Hill Community Development  
Organization  
Center for Support of Indigenous Peoples of the  
North  
Indigenous Peoples of Africa Co-ordinating  
Committee (IPACC)  
Indigenous peoples and sustainable  
development, Cameroon  
International Indigenous Forum on Biodiversity  
Kanuri Development Association

Red de Estudios de la Diversidad del Sur  
(RedSur)  
Red de Mujeres Indígenas sobre Biodiversidad  
de América Latina y el Caribe  
Society for Wetland Biodiversity Conservation,  
Nepal  
Southeast Indigenous Peoples' Center  
SURA-MAMA (Mbororo Indigenous women  
development Organization), Cameroon  
TAFO MIHAAVO  
Tebtebba

## **F. Non-governmental organizations**

<p>Africa CSO Alliance African Wildlife Foundation Agence française pour la biodiversité Alliance of Bioversity International and CIAT Association des Personnes Rénovatrices des Technologies Traditionnelles Association of Fish and Wildlife Agencies Association Marocaine pour la Protection de l'Environnement et du Climat Aube Nouvelle pour la Femme et le Développement Bank Information Center Biodiversity Sri Lanka Birdlife International Born Free Foundation Brahma Kumaris Carbone Guinée CBD Women's Caucus/Women4biodiversity Conservation International Cooperativa Autogestionaria de Servicios Profesionales para la Solidaridad Social, R.L. CoopeSoliDar R.L./ ICSF/ ICCA Consortium CORDIO East Africa Ecoropa European Bureau for Conservation and Development (EBCD) Environmental Conservation Trust of Uganda (ECOTRUST) Fisheries Council of Canada Forest Peoples Programme Foundation for Biodiversity Research (FRB) Friends of the Earth Europe Fundación Ambiente y Recursos Naturales Fundación Biodiversidad Global Environment Centre Global Forest Coalition Greenpeace India Water Foundation</p>	<p>Institute for Global Environmental Strategies International Fund for Animal Welfare Indigenous Peoples of Africa Co-ordinating Committee Kanuri Development Association MedPAN - Mediterranean Protected Areas Network Namibian Association of Community based Natural Resources Management Support Organization (NACSO) National Institute of Seeds National Whistleblower Center Natural Resources Defense Council Ocean One Social Research Centre Outreach Network for Gene Drive Research Pastoralist Information and Development Organization Plant Resources Center, Viet Nam Pro Natura - Friends of the Earth Switzerland Rainforest Foundation Norway Reservas Votorantim SINCHI Amazonic Institute of Scientific Research Southeast Asian Fisheries Development Center Sustainable Environment Food and Agriculture Initiative The Nature Conservancy The WILD Foundation Thinking Animals United TRAFFIC International Transparent World Wildlife and Environmental Society of Malawi Wildlife Conservation Society (WCS) World Animal Net World Wide Fund for Nature (WWF) WWF International WWF South Africa WWF UK</p>
---	--

## **G. Industry**

<p>Agence Française de Développement Agroicone ARB BiodivConsultancy Assessa Indústria, Comércio e Exportação Ltda Associação Brasileira da Indústria de Alimentos Bank Information Center Bayer AG Beraca Ingredientes Naturais</p>	<p>Bloomberg Law Brainfarma Indústria Química e Farmacêutica S.A. Brazilian National Confederation of Industry Brazilian Tree Industry CII India Business and Biodiversity Initiative Confederation of Indian Industry Coty Inc.</p>
--	--

CropLife International  
Global Industry Coalition (GIC)  
Groupe Rocher  
Grupo Boticário, Brazil  
GSS Sustentabilidade e Bioinovação  
International Chamber of Commerce  
International Council on Mining and Metals  
International Federation of Pharmaceutical  
Manufacturers and Associations  
International Seed Federation

KS. Solutions, Lda  
L'Oréal  
Marinello Advogados  
Nascimento e Mourão Advogados  
NatureConsult  
Sindusfarma, Brazil  
Union for Ethical Biobusiness  
Vale  
Willis Towers Watson

#### **H. Local authorities**

Advisory Committee on Subnational  
Governments and Biodiversity

Aichi Prefecture (Japan)  
Government of Quebec

#### **I. Youth**

Global Youth Biodiversity Network (GYBN)

#### **J. Observers**

German Agency for International Cooperation  
(Deutsche Gesellschaft für Internationale  
Zusammenarbeit) (GIZ)

Saudi Wildlife Authority

---