



Global Forest Coalition Statement on Agenda Item 3 of SBI-3

Thank you for this opportunity to contribute to this debate on behalf of the Global Forest Coalition, a worldwide coalition of 114 Indigenous Peoples Organizations, NGOs and women's groups from 69 different countries.

The Global Biodiversity Outlook 5 is a stark reminder that Aichi Biodiversity Targets have not been achieved. Of the 20 Targets, Targets 10, 16 and 17 had a time line of 2015. Our failure to achieve targets, especially Target 2 (integration of biodiversity values to national development planning and strategies), Target 3 (elimination and phasing out of perverse subsidies harmful to biodiversity), Target 5 (reducing rate of loss of natural habitats and forests), Target 9 (eradication of alien invasive species), Target 11 (equitable and effective conservation of areas of importance for biodiversity), Target 14 (restoration and safeguarding of essential services related to water, health, livelihood and well-being, taking in to account the needs of women, IPLCs, the poor and vulnerable), Target 17 (national biodiversity strategy and action plans), and Target 18 (respecting traditional knowledge and practices of Indigenous Peoples and Local communities (IPLCs), customary use of biological resources and implementation of the Convention with the full and effective participation of IPLCs) indicate that the political will to conserve, restore and halt biodiversity loss is still low.

While the CBD Secretariat has prepared an assessment of the progress of achievement of Aichi Biodiversity Targets, no review and evaluation has been so far made to find out barriers and obstacles responsible for the failure to achieve Aichi Targets. The recommendations proposed in document CBD/SBI/3/2 are a disappointing proposal to continue business like usual in this respect. The 2011-2020 Strategy failed, the Aichi targets are not achieved and we don't know why, and yet we are embarking on another ambitious Global Biodiversity Framework (GBF) with a fresh set of goals, targets and timelines.

In essence we are moving forward but without lessons being learnt or perhaps, not wanting to learn from failures. The victims are biodiversity, our planet, our nature, the vulnerable communities, IPLCs, women, the poor.

The GBF pathway should therefore begin with a robust review and evaluation of the failure to achieve the Aichi Targets. Lack of policy coherence, especially in the field of finance, is one of the main reasons for this failure, and perverse incentives are at the heart of this. It is simply irrational to assume the Aichi Targets could have been implemented as long as Parties to the CBD continue to spend between 4 to 6 trillion USD per year in subsidies, fiscal advantages and other perverse incentives that are harmful for biodiversity. How could we expect individuals and other actors on the ground to conserve biodiversity when so many regulatory, fiscal and economic incentives encourage them to destroy it?

Thus, perverse incentive reform was and continues to be at the heart of biodiversity conservation. It could also free up trillions of dollars in finance, not only for biodiversity conservation, but also for post-Covid recovery, health care and other social, economic and cultural priorities. So why have

Governments failed to implement Aichi Target 3? Any serious review of obstacles to the implementation of the Aichi Targets should start with this question.

A recent [report by the Global Forest Coalition](#) based on analysis in 9 different countries concluded that corporate capture of policy-making formed the main obstacle to perverse incentive reform. As long as biodiversity policy and policies in sectors like agriculture, forestry, fisheries and mining that impact on biodiversity are steered by the very corporations that benefit from harmful subsidies, we cannot expect these subsidies to be phased out or reformed. Thus, successful implementation of the CBD and its Strategic Frameworks requires, first and foremost, a profound review of governance structures to ensure Governments and other public institutions can act independently from the commercial interests of powerful corporations and in the interest of the broader society they are supposed to represent. This implies all forms of public private partnerships, blended finance and other structures creating financial dependencies of public institutions on private commercial interests should be phased out. Sadly, we have seen the CBD, and its financial mechanism the GEF, moving into the opposite direction the past decade.

Yet, not all is lost, as the recently launched [digital version of the 2nd Local Biodiversity Outlooks](#) have shown. Indigenous Peoples, local communities and women on the ground continue to implement inspiring community conservation initiatives, including ICCAs and other collective actions, based on their traditional knowledge and spiritual values. We welcome the increase in national reporting on Aichi Target 18 in this respect, which demonstrates a notably increased awareness of the importance of respecting and supporting collective actions and related traditional knowledge of Indigenous Peoples and local communities, including in particular women's collective actions and traditional knowledge. Yet, this awareness is too seldom followed up by action. It is disappointing to see 40% of the national reports do not even mention Article 18 and that 90% of Parties have failed to engage IPLCs in NBSAP processes, while hardly any Parties reported they were implementing Aichi Target 18 in a comprehensive manner. This remains a major stumbling block to the overall implementation of the CBD and its existing and future Strategic Plan. It makes it evident that mainstreaming respect for the rights and collective actions of IPLCs and women in the post-2020 GBF, on top of a specific target, is key to a successful implementation of this framework.

Last, but certainly not least, we welcome the increasing awareness of the role, and rights, of women in biodiversity conservation, and the need to mainstream gender in biodiversity conservation. We strongly welcome the recommendation that "for the post-2020 global biodiversity framework, gender should be integrated across the framework, similar to the way it is treated in the Sustainable Development Goals." This implies there should be both a specific target to recognize, respect and support the rights, role, needs and aspirations of women and non-binary people in biodiversity conservation, and, on top of this, gender-responsiveness should be integrated throughout the GBF. We agree this also requires a new Gender Action Plan and we stand ready to support the elaboration and implementation of such an Action Plan, which, together with a dedicated target in the post-2020 GBF, would form an important tool to ensure that gender is fully mainstreamed in both NBSAPs and in global CBD policy decisions, too many of which continue to be partly or even fully gender-blind. In that light, there is a clear need for further capacity-building on the collection and analysis of sex-disaggregated data, and gender-responsive reporting at all levels of biodiversity policy, locally, nationally, and globally.

Thank you.