



## Convention on Biological Diversity

Distr.  
GENERAL

CBD/POST2020/WS/2020/4/1  
6 July 2020\*

ENGLISH ONLY

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

Online, 27 July-8 October 2020

### SUMMARY OF COMMENTS ON TARGETS RELATED TO THE SUSTAINABLE USE OF BIOLOGICAL DIVERSITY

*Note by the Executive Secretary*

1. The consultation on the sustainable use of biological diversity for the post-2020 global biodiversity framework originally scheduled to be held in Bern, from 30 March to 1 April 2020 was cancelled due to the ongoing COVID-19 pandemic.<sup>1</sup> As an alternative to a face-to-face meeting, a series of webinars, a survey and an online forum are being organized to ensure that further views on elements related to the sustainable use of biodiversity for the post-2020 global biodiversity framework are elicited in-depth.
2. The purpose of the present document is to provide background information for the Thematic Consultation on the Sustainable Use of Biological Diversity for the Post-2020 Global Biodiversity Framework.
3. In recommendation [23/1](#), the Subsidiary Body on Scientific, Technical and Technological Advice requested the Executive Secretary to invite written submissions from Parties and others for views on possible targets, indicators and baselines related to the drivers of biodiversity loss as well as on species conservation and the mainstreaming of biodiversity across sectors in relation to the development of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework. All submissions of views were received and made accessible here: <https://www.cbd.int/conferences/post2020/submissions/2019-108>.
4. The tables presented in the present document include summaries of discussions and comments made on targets that relate to the sustainable use of biodiversity, including discussions from the second meeting of the Open-ended Working Group on the Post-2020 Global Biodiversity Framework, comments received through written submissions from notification [2019-08](#); and comments from discussions held at previous thematic workshops.<sup>2</sup> The summaries in the tables do not represent exhaustive lists.
5. Targets 4, 8, 9, 13 and 15 of the draft monitoring framework for the post-2020 global biodiversity framework for peer review<sup>3</sup> prepared for the twenty-fourth meeting of the Subsidiary Body on Scientific,

\* Reissued on 21 July 2020 for technical reasons.

<sup>1</sup> See notification [2020-029](#)

<sup>2</sup> The Secretariat has convened a number of thematic workshops and consultations for the post-2020 global biodiversity framework. For the purpose of this documents, the reports of three thematic workshops where the sustainable use of biological diversity was also broadly discussed were analysed. The reports of the following consultations were analysed: ecosystem restoration; marine and coastal biodiversity, and area-based conservation measures. All reports can be found at: <https://www.cbd.int/conferences/post2020>.

<sup>3</sup> <https://www.cbd.int/sbstta/sbstta-24/post2020-monitoring-en.pdf>

Technical and Technological Advice are some of the targets pertaining to the sustainable use of biological diversity. The post-2020 global biodiversity framework aims to address all three objectives of the Convention and these targets have been selected to gain further insight on those elements related to the sustainable use of biodiversity in the framework.

**Target 4:** By 2030, ensure that the harvesting, trade and use of wild species of fauna and flora, is legal, at sustainable levels and safe.

**Components of the target:**

T4.1. Harvest is legal, sustainable and safe for human health and biodiversity

T4.2. Trade is legal, sustainable and safe for human health and biodiversity

T4.3. Use is legal, sustainable and safe for human health and biodiversity

Comments related, or broadly related, to the target		
Second meeting of the Open-ended Working Group <sup>4</sup>	Notification 2019-08 <sup>5</sup>	Selected thematic workshops <sup>6</sup>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Target should address the threats to biodiversity rather than promote even greater extraction and use.</li> <li>• Important for the target to address illegal harvest and exploitation, illicit trade, and unsustainable use of wild species. Target should take measures to reduce unsustainable and illegal offtake.</li> <li>• Target should ensure that measures and mechanisms are in place to ensure the sustainable use of wild species without asking for a decrease in sustainable use. Ensure that harvests are at sustainable levels based on relevant scientific information.</li> <li>• Links could be built with trade-related</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The framework should be clear that the target is to combat illegal take and use of wild species (animals and plants; marine and terrestrial), and to ensure that any such take and trade are sustainable (rather than to promote trade). It also should be clarified that this refers to both domestic use and trade, as well as international trade.</li> <li>• This could lead directly to the perverse outcome of unwarranted legalisation of rightfully illegal wildlife trade to meet the Target. A Target that addresses the root cause of illegal and unsustainable wildlife trade could encourage coordinated international efforts to target and reduce illegal wildlife trade routes and facilitate innovative detection measures.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Need for communication, cooperation and collaboration with relevant authorities and regional seas organizations and regional fishery bodies, including through the Sustainable Ocean Initiative Global Dialogue with Regional Seas Organizations and Regional Fishery Bodes.</li> <li>• Behavioural change is needed along the full value change– changes in demand can have a positive effect on marine ecosystems. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Approaches such as sustainability certification can facilitate this</li> </ul> </li> </ul>

<sup>4</sup> All comments in the document are summarized from [CBD/WG2020/2/4](https://www.cbd.int/conferences/post2020/submissions/2019-108). There is no particular order to the list of comments throughout the document.

<sup>5</sup> A total of 67 submissions to notification 2019-08 were analysed. The document presents a summary of comments in no particular order and is not an exhaustive list. The submissions can be found in: <https://www.cbd.int/conferences/post2020/submissions/2019-108>.

<sup>6</sup> The summary of comments is from selected thematic workshops that relates to the sustainable use of biodiversity and, broadly, to each target referenced. The reports of three thematic consultations were analysed for the purpose of this document. These are: consultation on ecosystem restoration; on marine and coastal biodiversity, and area-based conservation measures.

<b>Comments related, or broadly related, to the target</b>		
<b>Second meeting of the Open-ended Working Group<sup>4</sup></b>	<b>Notification 2019-08<sup>5</sup></b>	<b>Selected thematic workshops<sup>6</sup></b>
<p>instruments, such as CITES, as well as organizations such as the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations, in terms of collaboration but avoiding duplication.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Target should be traceable and comply with national and international regulations and commitments.</li> <li>• Target should ensure that stocks be healthy and resilient.</li> <li>• Target should recognize use of benefits, such as nutrition and livelihoods, to people and to respect the rights of indigenous peoples and local communities to collect and use wild species.</li> <li>• The inclusion of a reference to indigenous peoples and local communities is needed.</li> <li>• Target should include language on socioeconomically important species, including fish stocks.</li> <li>• Target is missing elements related to marine biodiversity, including threats, such as by-catch and bottom trawling.</li> <li>• Target should specifically address illegal, unregulated and unreported fishing as one of most serious threats, with profound economic and social consequences.</li> <li>• Important to address human-wildlife conflict either in target 5 or a merger of targets 5 and</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The target should adopt evidence-based strategies which recognize the intrinsic value of wildlife and account for this value in wildlife policy and management.</li> <li>• The target should promote the implementation of practical solutions that develop a culture of coexistence with wildlife, accounting for community values while minimizing the harm caused to individual animals (such as compassionate conservation).</li> <li>• The target should develop incentives for hunters, fishers and farmers to protect/conservate threatened species outside designated conservation areas.</li> <li>• The target should ban all inessential uses of wildlife, including recreational hunting and trophy hunting.</li> <li>• The target should prioritize the prosecution of wildlife trafficking, illegal hunting and unsustainable logging in criminal justice systems.</li> <li>• The target should encourage development of an environmentally friendly trade regime within WTO and create a global level playing field.</li> <li>• The target should encourage the provision of a private avenue for whistleblowing, reprisals or crimes against nature to be communicated by citizens and ministries to the international community and put in place measures and mechanisms for investigation and enforcement.</li> <li>• The term “wild species” as used here will need to</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The target should balance harvest by size distribution of species, as the function of the ecosystem depends on the size of the population.</li> <li>• Need to address sectors/activities that are driving species extinction.</li> <li>• Species subject to exploitation should be utilized in a way so as not to increase their threatened status.</li> <li>• Consider emerging diseases as a threat.</li> <li>• Take a sector-based approach to addressing threats to species.</li> <li>• Utilize traceability to improve industry accountability.</li> <li>• Need to prioritize ecosystems that are facing the highest pressures.</li> <li>• Address unsustainable fishing as a predominant driver of marine biodiversity loss.</li> <li>• Ecosystem Approach to Fisheries (i.e., management of fisheries that incorporates a focus on species and habitats - particular attention on threatened and declining species/habitats).</li> <li>• All aquatic species exposed to all forms of fishing and aquaculture - within freshwater, transitional, and marine</li> </ul>

<b>Comments related, or broadly related, to the target</b>		
<b>Second meeting of the Open-ended Working Group<sup>4</sup></b>	<b>Notification 2019-08<sup>5</sup></b>	<b>Selected thematic workshops<sup>6</sup></b>
<p>7.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Elements of Aichi Biodiversity Target 6 could be captured in the draft monitoring framework, including through indicators. The draft monitoring framework for the target contains many elements but could still be expanded, including in relation to fisheries and sustainable forest management.</li> <li>• Target should include additional concepts, including applying the ecosystem approach, safe ecological limits, and avoiding detrimental effects on non-target species and habitats.</li> <li>• Environmental crime, such as poaching and encroachment on protected areas should be addressed.</li> </ul>	<p>be defined to clarify understanding of the target. This target will be relevant to the wide range of coral reef species that are harvested, traded and used. It is suggested that the target includes some wording to reflect the fact that some wild species are sufficiently rare and threatened that they should never be harvested or traded and should only be used in a non-extractive way (e. g. wildlife-watching). As currently worded, the target could be interpreted to mean that all wild species can be exploited provided this is legal.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The zero draft does not feature a sufficient marine emphasis at the goal and target level, with most of the focus on marine issues buried in the indicators. Some Aichi Targets that formerly had prominence are now relegated to the indicator level (e.g. Aichi Target 6). The attempt to capture it in Target 5 with all other wildlife harvesting and trade issues may make it difficult for Governments to prioritize sustainable fishing, an issue identified by IPBES as having “the largest relative impact in the oceans”. This fragmentation risks the loss of coherence of national actions in such areas. By contrast, for example, a focused SDG 14 on oceans has been very successful in bringing attention to marine conservation and generating resources and capacity-building.</li> <li>• Overexploitation and unsustainability of wild species clearly needs to be addressed, and that this is best tackled by striving to ensure that harvesting, trade and use is at sustainable levels (Target 5). Addressing illegal trade is certainly</li> </ul>	<p>waters - are managed for long-term persistence of robust wild populations and healthy wild habitats, including by achieving:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Elimination of vessels/gears that (a) remove all or most species they encounter, and (b) damage habitats;</li> <li>○ Elimination of fisheries that operate illegally;</li> <li>○ Elimination of harmful subsidies;</li> <li>○ Demonstrated improvement in the population status of all depleted species exposed to fisheries.</li> </ul> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 100% well-managed ocean, as well as focus on areas that require special attention.</li> <li>• By 2030, all direct exploitation of wild species should be sustainable, legal and governed by ecosystem-based approaches, impacts for harvesting are within safe ecological limits, overexploitation is avoided and carried out without detrimental impacts to non-target species.</li> <li>• All environmental costs, across the lifecycle from extraction to waste treatment should be internalized.</li> <li>• Ratification and implementation of</li> </ul>

<b>Comments related, or broadly related, to the target</b>		
<b>Second meeting of the Open-ended Working Group<sup>4</sup></b>	<b>Notification 2019-08<sup>5</sup></b>	<b>Selected thematic workshops<sup>6</sup></b>
	<p>one of the actions that is needed for addressing this, but it is unlikely that all illegal activities can be eliminated, so with the current wording of the target this would almost certainly be unachievable. What is needed is to promote those activities that address illegal trade harvesting, trade and use. However, this is rather different from taking steps to ensure that harvesting, trade and use are sustainable. Steps to achieve sustainability and measures to counter illegality might be better dealt with separately. In fact, a number of actions needed for achieving sustainability are included in later targets, including Target 7 and Target 8, and the separation of Target 5 feels a bit contrived at present.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• We recommend that the post-2020 global biodiversity framework:               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Recognizes the contributions of SFM in productive forests to biodiversity conservation, especially in the tropics.</li> <li>○ Includes a target to increase the area of sustainably managed forests, including for productive purposes, taking into account the lessons learned from the implementation of Aichi Target 7. Indicators should include: the area of forests with management plans; the area of forests under SFM.</li> <li>○ Includes a target to promote the use of wood products and increase the production</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<p>measures such as the Port State Measures Agreement needed.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Straddling stocks should be managed and enforced in collaboration with neighbouring States.</li> <li>• No exploitation of threatened or endangered species, and bycatch of these species should be eliminated.</li> <li>• Need measurable target for limiting/eliminating destructive fishing practices.</li> <li>• Impact of recreational fisheries should be assessed and, where necessary, managed.</li> <li>• Species subject to exploitation should be utilized in a manner so as not to increase their threatened status.</li> <li>• Need to halt overall species declines by 2030, prevent human-driven extinctions of known threatened species, and improve/recover the status of 30% of known threatened species.</li> <li>• By 2030, habitats of commercially important marine species should be managed or protected.</li> <li>• By 2030, species at all levels should be valued and protected and sustainably used, and threats to them are addressed with respect to: connectivity, economic</li> </ul>

<b>Comments related, or broadly related, to the target</b>		
<b>Second meeting of the Open-ended Working Group<sup>4</sup></b>	<b>Notification 2019-08<sup>5</sup></b>	<b>Selected thematic workshops<sup>6</sup></b>
	<p>and trade of legally and sustainably produced tropical wood products through enabling government policies and incentive mechanisms aimed at building legal and sustainable supply chains. Indicators should include: the volume of production, consumption and trade of certified wood products.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A target on the elimination of the illegal production and trade of wood products is also needed.</li> </ul>	<p>value, and best available science.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• By 2050, the number of known species at risk of extinction due to anthropogenic activities should be reduced to zero.</li> <li>• By 2030, should be no loss of species, improved health of threatened species, and sustainable management of species.</li> <li>• Need to manage for abundance and recovery.</li> <li>• Sustainable use of the species should be encouraged, including through international trade.</li> <li>• Regarding temporary fishery closures, the fishery management laws in many countries require that these are only in place for a specific time period, which would seem to limit their ability to meet the criteria for the identification of an OECM, which is meant to be “in place for the long term or [is] likely to be”. Often the intent is for the fishery closures to be renewed, but legally they are going to be time-bound.</li> <li>• While “100% sustainable Earth” is not necessarily the recommended phrasing, the concept is appropriate as a long-term goal. The term ‘sustainable’ is associated with “open for exploitation” by some, so careful consideration around the use of language will be needed. The ‘100%</li> </ul>

<b>Comments related, or broadly related, to the target</b>		
<b>Second meeting of the Open-ended Working Group<sup>4</sup></b>	<b>Notification 2019-08<sup>5</sup></b>	<b>Selected thematic workshops<sup>6</sup></b>
		<p>sustainable’ proposal could be linked to the planetary boundaries concept;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• In many places, there has been movement away from management practices that are ‘biodiversity-supportive’ (for example with agricultural intensification, application of pesticides, etc.).</li> <li>• The concept of Biosphere Reserves was raised as a model for area-based conservation combining conservation and sustainable use.</li> <li>• By 2030, 50% of landscapes and seascapes outside of protected areas and OECMs should be managed in ecologically sustainable ways that are integrated with and supportive of protected areas and OECMs achieving the in-situ conservation of biodiversity in the face of climate change.</li> <li>• Should take a ‘whole-ocean’ approach, whereby 30% is highly or fully protected and 70% is sustainably managed.</li> </ul>



**Target 8:** By 2030, ensure benefits, including nutrition, food security, livelihoods, health and wellbeing, for people, especially for the most vulnerable through sustainable management of wild species of fauna and flora

**Components of the target:**

T8.1. Sustainable management of aquatic wild species of fauna and flora, including fisheries

T8.2. Sustainable management of terrestrial wild species of fauna and flora

Comments related, or broadly related, to the target		
Second meeting of the Open-ended Working Group	Notification 2019-08	Selected thematic workshops
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The mention of health and nutrition in the target may be beyond the scope of the Convention.</li> <li>• The target should address the wider social, economic and cultural benefits that wild species provide.</li> <li>• The target could reference the notion of “human-wildlife interactions” instead of “human-wildlife conflict”.</li> <li>• It may be appropriate to replace “wildlife” with “wild species” in the target.</li> <li>• The inclusion in the target of domesticated species, including local varieties and semi-domesticated species, are also threatened or facing extinction and fall outside mainstreaming agriculture, also providing ecosystem benefits, including nutrition, livelihoods and cultural benefits, especially for indigenous peoples and local communities, should be considered.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• We are concerned that, as it is currently written, this target could be interpreted in years to come as conferring a right to increase the exploitation of wild species without due regard to the long-term sustainability of such exploitation.</li> <li>• The intent of this goal is supported but should be linked closely to Target 5 above and include advice that the benefits of the use of wild species must be seen by all people across the socio-economic strata (to avoid confusion over the definition of vulnerable).</li> <li>• Significant redrafting of target 7 on sustainable use of wild species, to ensure it is focused on the sustainability of any use. If the intent is to ensure a greater proportion of the benefits from any use accrue to the most vulnerable, then it needs to rephrased in this way, rather than a blanket aim to simply enhance the extent and value of use overall, which is only likely to encourage further overexploitation of species already under significant pressure.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Need to consider environmental justice for small-scale fishers and other vulnerable groups.</li> <li>• Traditional knowledge needs to be fully incorporated into management decisions.</li> <li>• Focus on fisheries should look more broadly than just commercial fisheries.</li> <li>• Communication with local communities is key, including in terms of implications of cultural preferences and perceptions for food habits.</li> <li>• All exploited systems are at sustainable biomass levels that support biodiversity and human use.</li> <li>• To ensure food, livelihoods and healthy marine ecosystems for future generations, fisheries do not have impacts on target or other species, habitats or ecosystems whose recovery is not secured if the pressure is reduced or</li> </ul>

<b>Comments related, or broadly related, to the target</b>		
<b>Second meeting of the Open-ended Working Group</b>	<b>Notification 2019-08</b>	<b>Selected thematic workshops</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The non-consumptive uses of biodiversity, such as wildlife tourism, could be captured by the target.</li> <li>• The target as it is, could have unintended consequences. For example, reducing human-wildlife conflict could be achieved by culling.</li> <li>• The target could also address trade.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Target 7 and the accompanying indicator framework are worded in such a way as to imply increasing harvest/use of wild species. IFAW believes this will rarely be an option given the high harvest pressure that already exists on most target species. The focus on these targets should be flipped to emphasize the need to improve the conservation status for targeted wild species, so that benefits to people can be maintained and potentially in the future provide more benefits over time.</li> <li>• It should also be clear that any use is consistent with Parties' commitments in other international agreements, and that these are effectively monitored and enforced.</li> <li>• IFAW recommends that this target be thoroughly re-worded to ensure the focus is on the sustainability of any use and that any focus on enhancing benefits to people, focuses on the proportion of benefits flowing to the most vulnerable. Otherwise, this target will directly counter efforts elsewhere in the framework to prevent overexploitation.</li> <li>• This target should be worded to reflect the fact that some species should probably not be exploited for human use and should only be used in a non-extractive manner. Often those individuals involved in the capture of wild species (e. g. in the live reef fish trade, trade in ornamental species) do not get a fair share of the value of the trade. Issues of equity, trade and transparency are important ensuring that the source countries and communities</li> </ul>	<p>removed, considering the life history and regeneration capacity.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• When land is restored with agroforestry, and wildlife re-enters these ecosystems, will end up in human wildlife conflicts and add to biodiversity loss.</li> <li>• “Stacked Benefits” (“stacked outcomes”) of restoration present different levels of values to different parts of society:             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Enhancing fisheries</li> <li>○ Social and economic benefits fisheries, healthy fish stocks</li> <li>○ Reduced vulnerability against invasive alien species</li> <li>○ Recovery (including biomass recovery)</li> <li>○ Job creation and generation</li> <li>○ Resilience—Economic resilience, but also resilience to anthropogenic pressures</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Target(s) must also consider the protection and resilience of socioecological landscapes. The benefits that biodiversity conservation has for people should be captured and measured.</li> <li>• Ecosystem restoration will contribute to sustainable use of wild species by supporting species recovery. Sustainable</li> </ul>

<b>Comments related, or broadly related, to the target</b>		
<b>Second meeting of the Open-ended Working Group</b>	<b>Notification 2019-08</b>	<b>Selected thematic workshops</b>
	<p>see increased benefits from sustainable use of wild species.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Human-wildlife conflict should be the subject of a target in its own right since it is such a significant challenge. Currently, is it tacked on to the end of a wider target and therefore likely to be overlooked or de-prioritized.</li> <li>• There is a need to stress vulnerable communities which can also provide effective stewardship. Again, here, having a percentage target on human-wildlife conflict implies that the present number of human-wildlife conflicts (i.e. the baseline) is regularly monitored and presently known. Is that true?</li> <li>• As written, this covers essentially the same content as Target 5, only it seems to say that the use of wild species should be increased (“enhanced”). This is the opposite of what should be the goal! Targets 5 and 7 should somehow be combined or clarified.</li> <li>• IFAW recommends removing the reference to human wildlife conflict in this target. Firstly, the linking of human-wildlife conflict to a target on sustainable use implicitly implies that use of wildlife is the only response to conflict, when this is in fact not the case. Nor is it appropriately addressing the key driver of human-wildlife conflict, which is not whether such wildlife is used or not, but rather land use that brings humans into conflict with wildlife. This indicator should be incorporated under targets addressing land-use change.</li> </ul>	<p>use of the species should be encouraged, including through international trade.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Need to promote evidence-based interventions to improve human-wildlife interactions.</li> <li>• To promote sustainable use through participatory action and capacity-building and generating long-term income opportunities and improving livelihoods.</li> <li>• There is a need to consider trade-offs, either between areas important for biodiversity and areas important for ecosystem services, or between different services (for example, enhancing one ecosystem service may diminish others).</li> </ul>

<b>Comments related, or broadly related, to the target</b>		
<b>Second meeting of the Open-ended Working Group</b>	<b>Notification 2019-08</b>	<b>Selected thematic workshops</b>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• This target focusses only on the direct benefits of species conservation to people in terms of food security etc. It overlooks the broader economic contributions – at the national as well as local and personal levels – that can be generated as a result of sustainable use including through tourism, hunting, trade etc. In some cases, these economic benefits are sufficient to make substantive contributions to national GDP, export earnings, jobs and spin-off businesses. Potentially, a separate target is required that recognizes that opportunities that biodiversity provides for private sector investment and associated economic development, bearing in mind the WEF 2020 report highlighting biodiversity loss as a major risk to doing business.</li> <li>• The target should also consider including domesticated species, local varieties of crops and breeds and their wild relatives.</li> </ul>	

**Target 9:** 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%].

**Components of the target:**

T9.1. Sustainable management of agricultural biodiversity, including soil biodiversity, cultivated plants and farmed and domesticated animals and of wild relatives

T9.2. Sustainable management of aquaculture

T9.3. Sustainable management of all types of forests

<b>Comments related, or broadly related, to the target</b>		
<b>Second meeting of the Open-ended Working Group</b>	<b>Notification 2019-08</b>	<b>Selected thematic workshops</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The concept of productivity gaps was not well understood, and more explanation is needed, including on the baselines and related indicators. This could be included in the glossary. Additionally, a request was made to delete this concept from the framework. It was stated that the concept of sustainable use was preferred, instead of referring to production.</li> <li>• The essence of target 8 could be improved by incorporating mainstreaming into elements of the target and extending the scope to all sectors addressed in the long-term approach to mainstreaming biodiversity.</li> <li>• Actions for sustainable use could include ecosystem restoration or ecosystem-based approaches.</li> <li>• The contribution of indigenous peoples and local communities and small-scale farmers</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Indigenous managed lands should be mentioned in equal position with agriculture. Further, the outcomes of this target should be reframed to ensure the benefits of sustainable use of biodiversity are also seen by the natural ecosystem, to maintain balance of the use and benefit derived.</li> <li>• This target may need to be carefully reassessed to include a precautionous addition of “productivity gaps” where these hamper self-sustainability and can be addressed without enhancing anthropogenic pressures or loss of natural habitats (e.g. small-scale landscape features).</li> <li>• The target is highly relevant for coral reef ecosystems in terms of coral reef fisheries, tourism, as well where there is management for multiple objectives (e.g. the Great Barrier Reef). Coral reef fisheries support some 6 million people “and are worth \$6.8 billion a year”. The current indicators however only focus on agricultural/ terrestrial</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Agriculture is the biggest driver of degradation. It was discussed that restoring protected areas is important, but we have other priorities to improve productivity. There was a suggestion to incorporate restoration of productive lands as a target alongside restoration for nature, in the sense of improving the amount of biodiversity and improving ecosystem functionality in agricultural areas.</li> <li>• Capacity-building should also target foresters, nature reserve managers and agriculture specialists to ensure that they incorporate the dimensions of ecosystem restoration in their work.</li> <li>• Sustainable agriculture should contribute to conservation.</li> <li>• By 2030, the net fragmentation of</li> </ul>

<b>Comments related, or broadly related, to the target</b>		
<b>Second meeting of the Open-ended Working Group</b>	<b>Notification 2019-08</b>	<b>Selected thematic workshops</b>
<p>could be acknowledged.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Reference was made to sustainable agriculture, agro-ecology, ecosystem-based, innovative approaches, agroforestry and organic farming, as well as all types of agriculture.</li> </ul>	<p>production systems. Coral reef tourism contributes \$36 billion to the global tourism industry annually. It is proposed that the indicator proposed under Target 2 could also be of use under this target ([area][%] of coral reefs under protected areas and other effective area based conservation measures).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>This Target is relevant for fisheries and relates also to Targets 5 and 7. A “productivity gap” is usually a ratio between a given productivity (e.g. of a reference country or ecosystem) and a selected benchmark. The meaning of this expression needs to be clarified if indicators and reference values need to be identified and reported.</li> <li>We suggest that the CBD post-2020 framework places the agenda of sustainable production and consumption more prominently, particularly in relation to food, if it is to drive transformative changes needed to tackle the root causes of biodiversity loss.</li> <li>Not clear what this “productivity gaps” refers to. Without this term being clearly defined, the target number has no use.</li> <li>Aquaculture should be included here.</li> <li>The avoidance of land use change, specifically loss and degradation of flower-rich habitats such as grasslands and shrublands, and the loss of a mosaic of smaller-scale native habitats within productive working landscapes. Specific targets here could include no net loss of grassland and shrub habitats, or restoration of native habitats to a minimum of</li> </ul>	<p>habitats by human infrastructures and by degradative agriculture, forestry, and grazing activities should be reversed.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>We need to restore for sustainable use and production (e.g., fisheries, agriculture), as well as for nature.</li> <li>There were a number of major risks or threats to connectivity identified, including, inter alia, roads and development corridors, agriculture and dams.</li> <li>In expanding protected area cover, there is also a need to account for opportunity costs to other sectors or other development needs that may rely on these resources. This is something that is being explored, at least for agriculture, which is the main competitor for space in terrestrial areas. In marine areas, studies have also explored the potential food provisioning benefits of expanding marine protected areas.</li> </ul>

<b>Comments related, or broadly related, to the target</b>		
<b>Second meeting of the Open-ended Working Group</b>	<b>Notification 2019-08</b>	<b>Selected thematic workshops</b>
	<p>20% of the area of all working landscapes globally.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The framework should contain sectoral targets (on sustainable food systems and agriculture, fisheries, forestry, and infrastructure sector) to create action. Parties at SBSTTA-23 broadly supported this approach.</li> <li>• Given the significant role of unsustainable food production and consumption patterns in nature’s deterioration, addressing this is also in the remit of the CBD. Therefore, and because there are numerous existing indicators within the SDG indicator framework (Table 1, “indicator” column); which could be used in combination with other indicators in reports submitted by Parties to the CBD, we propose the use of the same indicators, thus reducing reporting burden while tracking progress against targets.</li> </ul>	

**Target 13:** 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.

**Components of the target:**

T13.1. Biodiversity reflected in planning at all levels

T13.2. Biodiversity reflected in national and other accounts

T13.3. Biodiversity values are reflected in policies and regulations, including on biodiversity inclusive environmental impact assessments and strategic environmental assessments

Comments related, or broadly related, to the target		
Second meeting of the Open-ended Working Group	Notification 2019-08	Selected thematic workshops
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• It was suggested that the text of the target needs to be simplified, as not all Parties may use the different instruments that are already, or could be, referenced. It could also be split into two targets.</li> <li>• It was noted that one of the goals of the long-term strategic approach on mainstreaming, currently under development by the informal advisory group on mainstreaming, has similar language and that these linkages to the long-term strategic approach to mainstreaming need to be taken into account. The long-term strategic approach to mainstreaming could support implementation of a goal on mainstreaming in the post-2020 global biodiversity framework. It was also stressed that mainstreaming should be a key priority for</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Include into target: (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.</li> <li>• All targets on regulatory tools to address drivers and use should encompass considerations regarding their impacts on poverty in developing countries.</li> <li>• We commend the inclusion of this target and note that biodiversity-inclusive environmental impact assessments and strategic environmental assessments are critical tools to mitigate the impacts of development on biodiversity. However, we note that the mitigation hierarchy (avoid, minimize, restore, offset) is not reflected</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Utilise strategic environmental assessment, especially for new and emerging uses like ecotourism.</li> <li>• Different types of measures can be used in different places (e.g. zones for conservation; zones for sustainable use; zones available for transformation, etc.).</li> <li>• Priority capacity-building topics include:                         <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ strategic planning for national level restoration programmes</li> <li>○ agroforestry</li> <li>○ ecotourism planning and development</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Negative effects of financing mechanisms, spatial planning strategies, and economic sectors' activities should be assessed and</li> </ul>



<b>Comments related, or broadly related, to the target</b>		
<b>Second meeting of the Open-ended Working Group</b>	<b>Notification 2019-08</b>	<b>Selected thematic workshops</b>
<p>the framework.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Synergies with relevant targets under the Sustainable Development Goals need to be harnessed.</li> <li>• The following elements were suggested to be reflected in the target:               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Mainstreaming biodiversity into production sectors;</li> <li>○ Role of subnational governments;</li> <li>○ Use of appropriate tools such as strategic environmental assessments, environmental impact assessment and natural capital accounting, when relevant;</li> <li>○ Natural capital financial accounting systems;</li> <li>○ The diverse values of biodiversity and ecosystem services;</li> <li>○ Payments for ecosystem services; Ensuring implementation of environmentally friendly approaches across different sectors;</li> <li>○ Ensuring that biodiversity values are included in curricula at all levels, including the tertiary level;</li> <li>○ Environmental impact assessment should be participatory and involve indigenous peoples and local communities, academia, investors and business;</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<p>here and should be. This widely recognized hierarchy sets out key actions for Parties and stakeholders to take while engaging in planning processes. We note that this is also relevant to the first Action Target (para. 12(a)(1)) on spatial plans and retention and restoration of intact ecosystems, and recommend consideration of moving spatial planning to this target.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• In order to succeed in achieving the frameworks' goals, it is critical not only to include sector specific targets but also to put in place the right mechanisms to ensure that actors from each critical sector for biodiversity come together and take action. The lack of specific mechanisms has been one of the causes of the failure of the current strategic plan to promote sectoral action. These plans should take into account the full range of biodiversity values. WWF is proposing to develop and implement national, regional and global action plans for each of the main sectors critical to halting and reversing biodiversity loss. These plans should be developed in a participatory way to ensure that all key stakeholders of each sector take collective and coordinated action toward reversing biodiversity loss. This would also help to ensure that biodiversity is integrated into sectoral or development plans at all levels.</li> <li>• Mainstreaming IPLC culture and cultural values in education systems is critical to promote transmission of traditional knowledge, values and languages that promote biodiversity conservation.</li> </ul>	<p>minimized.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Land-use planning should integrate development activities and sectors.</li> <li>• Interested stakeholders' structure, including governance structures, needs consideration.</li> <li>• Spatial planning covers both land and sea; the interrelationships between landscape and seascape needs consideration (for example ridge to reef approaches).</li> <li>• Ecosystem restoration to alleviate poverty by introducing other means of income generating activities reducing the pressure on natural resources.</li> <li>• Some language in the framework on data-sharing could be as follows:               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Environmental data collected for assessment and management of marine sectors are freely available for status assessment and impact assessment.</li> <li>○ Baseline information, for the purpose of understanding degradation in marine environment, environmental impact assessments and monitor change due to climate change is available by [XX] for all areas experiencing pressures from human activities.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• All human activities should be well</li> </ul>

<b>Comments related, or broadly related, to the target</b>		
<b>Second meeting of the Open-ended Working Group</b>	<b>Notification 2019-08</b>	<b>Selected thematic workshops</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ The term ‘all sectors’ should be considered in the broadest sense, including sectors such as health, finance and infrastructure with consideration given to how this can be incorporated into the monitoring framework.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Investment and work is needed at a national scale to explore and understand better the linkage between global and national targets and indicators, and how it might be improved.</li> <li>● The post-2020 global biodiversity framework may include explicit mentions of how private sector organizations can contribute further to the post-2020 global biodiversity framework. Governments and the private sector need to work together as well as to exchange information, best practices and experiences to promote and increase the contribution from the private sector to conservation and sustainable use.</li> <li>● It is widely recognized that the values of plant diversity are not widely reflected in decision making. For example, though numerous studies, at various scales, have illustrated the economic value of plant diversity and the ecosystem services it underpins. Including the values of plant diversity in national and local development and poverty reduction strategies and planning processes and into nation accounting, as appropriate, and reporting systems, places plants into the same decision framework as other goods and services, and would help give it greater visibility amongst policy-makers and contribute to the “mainstreaming” of plant diversity issues in decision-making processes. Reflecting the values of plants in the planning processes of governments at all levels, including economic, financial, spatial planning, and the application of strategic environmental assessment, will help</li> </ul>	<p>managed and their impacts on marine ecosystems understood and subject to full life-cycle environmental assessment.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Need legislative frameworks including strong requirements for environmental impact assessment.</li> <li>● Need legislative framework including strong EIA laws implemented.</li> <li>● Industry can play a major role in offsetting impacts, although the use of offsets can be controversial.</li> <li>● Important to integrate language that business can relate to (not only the conservation community).</li> <li>● Corporate Social Responsibility and certification of business practices should be utilized.</li> <li>● The value of ecosystem services to industry/private sector needs to be better communicated to them (e.g., industries pay for ecosystems to clean water, their runoff is cleaned, and ecosystems are restored).</li> <li>● Payments for pollution to all degradative activities and uses of nature should be applied.</li> <li>● By 2030, implement integrated landscape and seascape planning to bring conservation and sustainable use policies into complementary alignment.</li> </ul>

<b>Comments related, or broadly related, to the target</b>		
<b>Second meeting of the Open-ended Working Group</b>	<b>Notification 2019-08</b>	<b>Selected thematic workshops</b>
	<p>internalize the costs and benefits of the conservation and sustainable use of plant diversity in decision-making.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• We further recommend that the successful integration of AZE site conservation into multiple sectors be considered as an indicator for mainstreaming biodiversity across sectors (GBF Target 13). The Alliance for Zero Extinction has identified 853 AZE sites, which are the areas that hold the last-remaining populations of one or more species evaluated to be Endangered or Critically Endangered on the IUCN Red List.</li> <li>• As pointed out by various partners, environmental impact assessments of any type, when inclusive of traditionally held lands and resources, must include participation by (or be led by) the owners of such lands and resources.</li> </ul>	

**Target 15:** 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

**Components of the target:**

T15.1. Sustainable consumption patterns

T15.2. New vision of good quality of life based on sustainability and new social norms for sustainability

T15.3. Peoples' responsibility for their choices

<b>Comments related, or broadly related, to the target</b>		
<b>Second meeting of the Open-ended Working Group</b>	<b>Notification 2019-08</b>	<b>Selected thematic workshops</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Several mentioned that these two targets (17 and 20) are too broad and present concepts that are not clearly defined, such as “just consumption” and “new social norms”. Corporate social responsibility could be more relevant. The issue was also raised that the wording of the target needs a stronger link to conservation.</li> <li>Several delegates noted the importance of addressing consumption patterns. Others also saw a need to promote both sustainable consumption and production patterns, as well as lifestyles. This should be accompanied by necessary fiscal and regulatory measures. Some delegates would like to see the measurement of the rate of consumption.</li> <li>Several delegates referred to SDG 12, noting their preference to use the language of SDG 12. Specific reference was made to targets 12.1 and 12.8 of SDG 12.5.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>We note with concern that this target is broad and may not be actionable for Parties and other stakeholders.</li> <li>Given that this framework will be a plan endorsed by governments, WWF suggests that this target focuses on promoting a proactive role on the part of governments in providing sustainable alternatives to consumers, and facilitating, encouraging and promoting better choices.</li> <li>Acting on consumption habits is one of the ways to improve fisheries sustainability by reducing demand but there could be debate on what a “just consumption level” is as neither tribunals nor States regulate such consumption levels”. Nonetheless, efforts towards ecolabelling and education of consumer choices are relevant.</li> <li>We suggest that the CBD post-2020 framework places the agenda of sustainable production and consumption more prominently, particularly in relation to food, if it is to drive transformative</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The link between conservation and consumption needs consideration, for example with the link between cities and unsustainable practices in rural environments and the need to focus on indirect drivers of biodiversity loss.</li> </ul>

<b>Comments related, or broadly related, to the target</b>		
<b>Second meeting of the Open-ended Working Group</b>	<b>Notification 2019-08</b>	<b>Selected thematic workshops</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Regarding the specific wording, some noted that addressing people goes beyond the remit of Parties while others mentioned that everyone has to be involved and expressed their support for the idea of addressing people, possibly through indicators. Others noted that the target could focus on effective measures on implementing policies and plans and identify relevant actors (governments, business and stakeholders at all levels).</li> <li>It was suggested that the two targets (17 and 20) could be merged.</li> <li>It was suggested that this target refers to transformative change and should rather be part of the 2030 mission instead of a target.</li> </ul>	<p>changes needed to tackle the root causes of biodiversity loss.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Successful experiences in transforming citizen behaviour involves incentives as well as strong, well designed public campaigns.</li> <li>Targets 1-16 are more or less SMART, but 17-20 are not. This unevenness was one of the problems with the Aichi Targets and must be improved this time. Some targets overlap too much, especially 14 and 17, which both cover mainstreaming in economic sectors. Some of these could be combined.</li> <li>Unlike other targets, this is not a national-scale target, but focuses on individual choices and lifestyle. This is not the appropriate focus for a UN decision, as it is the national Parties that will be implementing the framework. This should be reformulated into a national target and must also emphasize biodiversity.</li> <li>Reduce the negative carbon footprint of production and consumption. It is critical that the framework addresses the ecological footprint (and carbon footprint as part of it) of production and consumption. WWF proposes that this target focus on action that economic sectors can undertake to accelerate the transition to low carbon and sustainable food systems.</li> </ul>	