

**Statement by the Campaign for Nature on Agenda Item 4  
Third Meeting of the Open-ended Working Group on the Post-2020 Global Biodiversity  
Framework  
August 25, 2021**

The Campaign for Nature (CFN) is grateful to the Co-chairs and the Secretariat for their work on the First Draft of the Post-2020 Global Biodiversity Framework (GBF).

This statement focuses on targets relevant to protected and conserved areas, human rights, and resource mobilization, which we consider to be some of the most critical elements of the GBF.

CFN is strongly supportive of Target 1's component to "retain existing intact and wilderness areas" and believes that this iteration of the target marks a significant improvement over previous drafts. We support the International Indigenous Forum on Biodiversity's (IIFB) proposal to add a component to this target to ensure recognition of the rights of Indigenous peoples and local communities over lands, territories, waters and resources.

CFN is also strongly supportive of the inclusion of Target 3 in the GBF. This target is based in science, as a growing body of research has made it clear that 30% is the minimum amount of land, freshwater and sea areas that must be protected and conserved in order to help halt global biodiversity loss. We support the additions made to the language in Draft 1 of "especially areas of particular importance for biodiversity and its contributions to people" and the inclusion of "effectively and equitably managed, ecologically representative and well-connected systems."

CFN believes it is critical to revise Target 3 so that it explicitly ensures free prior and informed consent (FPIC) of Indigenous Peoples and local communities. We support improvements to the GBF that would appropriately recognize the contributions of Indigenous Peoples and local communities' to biodiversity conservation outcomes and area-based conservation targets through supporting their management, governance, and secure tenure rights on their collective lands and territories. We recommend revising the text so that it promotes "equitable governance" in addition to equitable management.

CFN believes that the ambition of the GBF must be matched by the resources required to implement it and we welcome Goal D, which calls for closing the financing gap, and the inclusion of Milestone D.1, which quantifies that gap at approximately \$700 billion over current levels.

We also welcome the inclusion of Target 18 related to reducing subsidies harmful to biodiversity by \$500 billion per year, along with Targets 14 and 15 related to integrating biodiversity into broader economic decision making.

We also welcome the inclusion of specific figures in Target 19 and have three specific recommended changes. First, additional resources need to increase over current levels by \$200 billion not increase to \$200 billion. Second, we believe it is critical for a significant portion of this increase to be in the form of grants from high-income countries to lower income countries. We believe “international financial flows” in the current draft should be replaced with “grants” and we recommend an increase of \$80 billion of such grants. Third, we recommend that a significant portion of the \$80 billion be directed to Indigenous Peoples and local communities.

CFN is pleased by the inclusion of Target 21 but we believe that there are still important ways that it can be strengthened, including by ensuring the legal recognition of Indigenous Peoples and local communities’ tenure rights over all lands, waters, and other resources that they customarily use. As one example of how to strengthen and build upon this target, we would like to highlight the [policy brief](#) released by the UN Special Rapporteur on Human Rights and the Environment.

The following provides additional justification and context for CFN’s recommendations on resource mobilization.

In order to close the \$700 billion gap in Milestone D.1, if harmful subsidies are reduced by \$500 billion compared to current levels (as in Target 18), then additional resources need to increase over current levels by \$200 billion.

We believe “international financial flows” in the current draft should be replaced with “grants” since international financial flows for biodiversity are not well defined and can theoretically include amounts ranging from investments by international private equity firms with market-based returns to bilateral grants from developed countries to developing countries and there is no baseline to establish existing levels of these total amounts. The additional \$80 billion of grants to developing countries, Indigenous people and local communities (out of the total increase in global funding of \$200 billion) we recommend is based on estimates that the developing world will require approximately one-third of total global biodiversity funding (based on forthcoming research on protected and conserved area costs for 30x30), which yield an estimate of the biodiversity funding gap in the developing world of approximately \$240 billion (one-third of the \$711 billion overall gap identified in the Paulson report). Estimates that one-third of the global biodiversity footprint is embedded in international trade yield the \$80 billion recommended amount of grants to developing countries (one-third of \$240 billion).

The 2nd edition of Local Biodiversity Outlooks (LBO-2) and the IPBES Global Assessment both detail the importance of Indigenous and local community managed and governed territories to curbing biodiversity loss, recognizing the historic role that IPLCs have played as stewards of the natural world and documenting the overlap between IPLC governed territories and the world’s most important areas for biodiversity. Indigenous Peoples and local communities are critical to implementing an ambitious post-2020 GBF and should receive a significant portion of the \$80 billion in grant funding directly from donors, which would constitute a meaningful increase over current meager funding levels.

We believe the points below help to put our \$80 billion recommendation in context and demonstrate this amount is both affordable and necessary:

- Nature is the foundation of civilization and the global economy. \$80 billion represents less than 0.1% of the \$85 trillion global GDP.
- The World Economic Forum estimates that \$44 trillion worth of economic value generation – over half of global GDP – depends moderately or highly on nature and its services.
- SwissRe found that 55% of global GDP depends on high-functioning biodiversity and ecosystem services. Their study revealed that one-fifth of countries worldwide are at risk of their ecosystems collapsing due to a decline in biodiversity and related services.
- The world has spent \$13.8 trillion on Covid-19 recovery - 170 times as much as the \$80 billion.
- As IPBES has concluded, the biodiversity crisis is as important as, and interrelated with, the climate crisis. Developed countries have pledged to provide \$100 billion of annual climate funding to developing countries. While advances in renewable energy, energy conservation and electrification of transport and other areas have created opportunities to attract large amounts of private (and public), return-seeking capital to address climate change, similar markets for nature and the services it provides are not nearly as developed and there is little evidence these markets will develop at scale in the near term. Therefore, public funding in the form of grants from donor governments and domestic public resources in all countries will continue to be the largest and most critical way to generate increases in tangible financial resources (beyond subsidy, regulatory and policy reforms) for the 2020-2030 period of the GBF.