

Mobilizing the chemicals conventions to protect biodiversity

Fiona Kinniburgh & Aleksandar Rankovic

Institute for Sustainable Development and International Relations
IDDRI – Sciences Po

- In post-2020, extending collaboration of biodiversity actors with arenas where governance of pressures is discussed
- Chemical pollution: major driver of biodiversity loss
- Chemical governance: Basel, Rotterdam, Stockholm, and Minamata Conventions are central
- There is also a 2020 target on chemical pollution (Johannesburg, 2002) and discussion on post-2020 renewal for some chemical-related processes
- Little work between biodiversity and chemical governance so far

Uncorrected Proof

Mobilising the chemical conventions to protect biodiversity

An example with pesticides and the Stockholm and Rotterdam Conventions

Fiona Kinniburgh (Bavarian School of Public Policy, Technical University of Munich), Aleksandar Rankovic (IDDRI)

Chemical pollution is a major driver of biodiversity loss. In the face of growing chemical production and use worldwide, biodiversity faces on-going and increasing threats from the 40,000 to 60,000 industrial chemicals in commerce and active use globally, and among them pesticides, as confirmed in IPBES reports. Worth over €45 billion globally, the pesticide industry alone uses about 600 different active substances, six times more than in 1960 according to UNEP's *Global Chemicals Outlook II* (2019). In addition to the Aichi Biodiversity Targets of the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD), which do not specifically address pesticides under the pollution reduction target (Target 8), another international goal critical to biodiversity conservation will also "expire" in 2020. Initially outlined at the 2002 World Summit on Sustainable Development in Johannesburg¹ and reiterated at Rio+20 in 2012, the goal sets out to achieve that chemicals, throughout their life cycle, are "used and produced in ways that minimise significant adverse impacts on human health and the environment". While some progress has been made, the global goal to minimise adverse effects of chemicals and waste will not be met by 2020. Parallel to the preparation of a post-2020 global framework for biodiversity governance, there are thus currently post-2020 discussions taking place on the sound management of chemicals and hazardous waste.

Actors of biodiversity have seldom engaged with the actors of chemical governance so far, while such collaboration could be fruitful to enhance the implementation of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework, to be adopted at CBD COP15 in China in late 2020. By taking the example of pesticides, this brief proposes to explore why increasing collaboration between the CBD and chemical conventions is an important issue for post-2020 biodiversity governance, as well as the forms such collaborations could take.

How could actors of biodiversity and chemical governance work more closely together?

Example of pesticides and Stockholm and Rotterdam conventions

- **Stockholm Convention on Persistent Organic Pollutants**
 - Listed chemicals are subject to elimination or highly restricted use
 - National implementation plans (NIPs) to enable phase-out
- **Rotterdam Convention on the Prior Informed Consent Procedure for Certain Hazardous Chemicals and Pesticides in International Trade**
 - Listed chemicals subject are subject to an information-sharing procedure between parties so that importing parties are aware of risks
 - Importing countries must provide consent before trade can occur
- **Both conventions have a scientific review committee responsible for screening the chemicals nominated by parties for addition to the convention annexes; chemicals must be added by the COP**

- 1. Expanding the list of pesticides included in the Stockholm and Rotterdam convention annexes**
 - *E.g.: Work with chemical negotiators for the addition of pesticides; notably by providing ecotoxicological expertise and info on existing alternatives*
- 2. Reinforcing institutional collaborations between biodiversity and chemicals conventions**
 - *Exchanges between Sec; EMG discussion; UNEA (e.g. Report for UNEA-5); joint initiatives.*
- 3. Enhancing non-state and multi-stakeholder cooperation between biodiversity and chemicals actors**
 - *SAICM and Action Agenda, side events at respective COPs*
- 4. Building collaboration at the level of national instruments and actors**
 - *Add pesticides in NBSAPs and include pesticides into national reporting, work jointly with chemical focal points*

Thank you!